DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 269 PS 013 126

AUTHOR Parker, Lynn

TITLE The Impact of Child Nutrition Budget Cuts: A Look at the States and Selected School Districts.

INSTITUTION Food Research and Action Center, Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Commonwealth Fund, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 126p.; Newspaper reprint articles on pages 90-101 in original document have been removed due to marginal legibility.
AVAILABLE FROM Food Research and Action Center, 1319 F Street, N.W. #500, Washington, DC 20004 ($3.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Breakfast Programs; *Budgeting; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; *Lunch Programs; National Surveys; *Nutrition; Questionnaires; *Retrenchment; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Impact Studies

ABSTRACT

Presented in this paper are results from a study conducted by the Food Research and Action Center to examine the immediate impact of the 1981 cuts in federal support for child nutrition programs on states, selected school districts, and students. The first step of the study included a brief review of literature regarding the nutritional problems of school-age children in the United States, the nutritional content of school lunches, the impact of school lunches on children's nutritional intake, the nutritional content of lunches not provided through the schools, and the relationship between the cost of school lunches and student participation in programs. Following this review, questionnaires were developed for state child nutrition directors, for key people in selected schools responsible for maintaining lunch programs and in schools that had dropped the program, and for children in those same elementary and secondary schools. Questionnaires were administered by anti-hunger advocates around the country. Forty-four states responded to the state director's questionnaire. In the selected school survey, data were collected from 19 schools that had maintained lunch programs (363 students in 11 states) and from 8 schools that had dropped programs (187 students in 4 states). In general, results suggest that the 1981-82 fiscal year budget cuts and legislative changes in the National School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program have had a severe impact on schools and school children nationwide. Copies of the questionnaires employed are appended along with other related materials. (MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222269

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE IMPACT OF CHILD NUTRITION BUDGET CUTS: A LOOK AT THE STATES AND SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Food Research and
Action Center (FRAC)

Fall 1982
$3.00

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cecilia Perry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS013126

A Word About FRAC

The Food Research and Action (FRAC) was organized in 1970 as a nonprofit law firm and advocacy center working with the poor and near poor to end hunger and malnutrition in the United States. Since then it has become recognized nationally as an authoritative source on the operation of the federal food programs. FRAC works primarily with the food stamp, school lunch and breakfast, elderly nutrition, child care food, summer food, and women, infants and children (WIC) programs as vehicles for addressing this nation's hunger problems. FRAC, with its staff of attorneys, experienced community workers, and nutritionists, informs the public, provides information to the Congress, monitors key programs, and assists community groups and other concerned citizens through its development of timely information and specially tailored materials on nutrition issues that respond to the new realities.

FRAC's agenda for the 1980's has four key elements:

- Developing targeted materials for the new decisionmakers at federal, state and local levels, based on actual experience;
- Building a base of support for the essential nutrition programs which provide the first line of defense against hunger;
- Re-establishing the link between nutrition and health - a connection too often forgotten in recent years; and
- Protecting the basic right to food.

Underlying all its work in the 1980's is a dual commitment:

1) to the promotion of cooperative efforts among organizations with common goals;

2) to the development of new ways of ensuring that community based anti-hunger efforts maintain their effectiveness despite diminishing resources.

FRAC depends on support from foundations, religious organizations, individual contributions, and the sale of its publications.

For more information on the child nutrition programs, contact:

Food Research and Action Center
1319 F Street, N.W. #500
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 393-5060

This report was prepared by Lynn Parker with support from a grant by the Commonwealth Fund.

Copyright 1982 - Food Research and Action Center, Inc. Reproduction permitted if credit is given and the reproduction is available free of charge. Cover cartoon used with permission of Mike Peters.

Table of Contents

Title	Page Number
Executive Summary	2
Acknowledgements	8
I. The School Lunch and Breakfast Programs: Background Information	9
II. Why This Study Was Done	15
III. Study Methodology	19
IV. Literature Review	23
Bibliography	33
V. Summary of Results	
A. The States	38
B. Selected Schools	61
VI. What Can We Conclude? What Can Be Done?	86
VII. Appendices	
A. School Lunch and Breakfast Program Eligibility Guidelines and Reimbursement Rates	89
B. Newspaper articles concerning 1981 legislative changes in the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs	90
C. Study Procedures	102
D. Study Questionnaires	105
E. States Responding to State Child Nutrition Director Questionnaire	127
F. Number of Students and Schools Lost Between 1980-81 and 1981-82	128

Executive Summary

School Nutrition Programs

Both the National School Lunch Program (begun in 1946) and the School Breakfast Program (initiated as a pilot program in 1966) had a common origin -- concern about the health of school children. With the outbreak of World War II, the United States discovered that many draftees had nutrition-related health problems which prevented them from serving in the military. Congress sought to avoid similar problems in the future through the enactment of the National School Lunch Act. The School Breakfast Program grew out of Congressional concern for poor children who came to school hungry and children who had to travel long distances to school. In 1975 when Congress made School Breakfast a permanent program, it stated that the Program should be made available to all schools where a school breakfast was needed to provide adequate nutrition.

Operations

Both programs are run by the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and its regional offices. State departments of education administer the program through school boards in local school districts. Schools are reimbursed by USDA for all lunches and breakfasts, based on family size and income -- free and reduced-price meals for lower income children and "paid" meals for higher income children. Schools are required to serve particular kinds and amounts of food in order to be reimbursed.

Participation Levels

Until recently School Lunch and Breakfast Program participation was steadily increasing. More than 90 percent of the nation's schools were participating in the Lunch Program and about one-third were participating in the Breakfast Program. Twenty-six million children ate school lunches (half of them from low income families) and 4 million ate school breakfasts, 86 percent of them children from families with incomes below 130 percent of the poverty line.

Budget Cuts

During the 1981 legislative session (which set budget levels for fiscal year 1982), severe and unprecedented cuts were made in all of the child nutrition programs. The School Breakfast Program was cut by 20 percent and the Lunch Program by 30 percent. These cuts were made through changes in income eligibility for free and reduced-price meals and by decreasing the federal subsidy for reduced-price and "paid" meals. Changes were also made in the applications that parents must fill out in order for their children to receive free free and reduced price meals.

Why We Did the Study

FRAC began to hear from local school food service workers and directors, state child nutrition directors, local parents' groups and anti-hunger groups concerning problems brewing nationwide as a result of the cuts in federal support for the child nutrition programs. Schools and students were beginning to drop out of the programs in large numbers.

FRAC decided to take a closer look at the immediate impact of the cuts on states, selected school districts, and students in those school districts. Moreover, we wanted to understand how some schools stayed in the program, while others dropped out immediately. We hoped that the information gathered would be helpful in maintaining participation by schools and students.

Literature Review

The first step in the study was to carry out a brief literature review on the nutritional problems of schoolchildren in the U.S., the nutritional content of the school lunch, the impact of school lunch on children's nutritional

intake, the nutritional content of alternatives to school lunch, and the relationship between the cost of school lunch and student participation in the program.

Our literature review revealed that:

° There are still children in the United States who do not consume diets that are nutritionally adequate, particularly children from low income families.

° The incidence of severe nutritional deficiency diseases is rare among U.S. school children. Although biochemical tests show some nutritional problems among some children, the only consistently reported problem is iron deficiency anemia. On the other hand, poor growth and development have been shown to be a serious problem among some children, especially low income children.

° The school lunch, as served and as consumed, often missed the goal of one-third of the Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDA) for several nutrients. However, these lunches still make a substantial contribution to the total daily nutrient intake of some children. For example, school lunch participants from low income households depend on their lunch for 34 to 49 percent of the day's nutrient intake. Moreover, lunches consumed by school lunch participants are more likely to meet the RDA when compared to those of non-participants.

° Alternatives to the school lunch -- bag lunch, a la carte lunch, the fast food meal, vending machine items -- do not match up nutritionally to school lunch.

° Deficiencies of specific nutrients have been shown to affect behavior and school performance. Studies of the effects of nutrition

programs, particularly the Breakfast Program, on school performance and behavior suggest that school meals do have a positive effect on learning.

° The cost of a school lunch or breakfast is inversely related to the level of participation in the Program.

How the Study Was Carried Out

Following the review of the literature, questionnaires were developed for state child nutrition directors, for key people in selected schools that had maintained the Lunch Programs and in schools that had dropped the Program, and for children in those same schools. The questionnaires were administered by anti-hunger advocates located around the country. Forty-four states responded to the state director's questionnaire. In the selected school survey data was collected from 19 schools (363 students in 11 states) that had maintained the School Lunch Program and 8 schools (187 students in 4 states) that had dropped School Lunch Program. These schools included both elementary and secondary students.

What We Found Out

The fiscal year 1982 budget cuts and legislative changes in the National School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program have had a severe impact on schools and schoolchildren nationwide. Sixty-two percent of the states responding had drops in student participation in the School Lunch Program of over 10 percent, and of those students dropping out, over one-third were low income. Sixty-five percent of the states responding had drops in student participation in the School Breakfast Program of over 10 percent, and of those students dropping out, fifty-nine percent were low income. In fact, the impact was worse, percentage-wise, on the amount of children who are no longer

participating in these two programs than on the amount of schools no longer operating these programs. It seems clear that the decrease in student participation in the Lunch and Breakfast Program can only be partially explained by drop-out of schools. Many students are dropping out of on-going programs. (The number of breakfast programs that have been dropped is especially surprising, considering that most children who participate are not paying children, and, therefore, this program should not have felt the budget crunch to the same extent that the School Lunch Program did.)

States have attempted many creative ways to maintain School Lunch and Breakfast participation by students and schools. However, only 13 of the 44 states responding provided financial support to their School Lunch Programs. Nevertheless, the amount of subsidy that these 13 state legislatures do provide is fairly substantial, and if it were pulled out, many lunch programs would suffer.

There were large drops in participation in the elementary and secondary schools with lunch programs that we surveyed. But despite the budget cuts in the School Lunch Program and the decreases in volume of lunches sold, these schools were able to maintain their lunch programs. (The majority of these schools received additional state or local funds for their lunch programs.) Each school changed one or more things in its operation of the Program in order to adapt to the federal cuts, but, unfortunately for the children and the employees, the most frequent changes were an increase in the price of the school lunch and a decrease in the number of employees or in the number of hours they worked. (Based on the 44 states surveyed, the average price for a paid lunch in the 1981-82 schoolyear was 79.8¢. Since the average price in 1980-81 was 63.5¢ this means that the price of a paid lunch increased by 16.3¢.) Three other changes that were mentioned, though less frequently, were: better use

of commodities, "merchandising" the Lunch Program, and changes in menu planning.

Children who dropped out of the Lunch Program and children who attended a school that had ended its Lunch Program depended on bag lunches, ate from the a la carte line at school, or did not eat lunch at all. (In the secondary schools, students also used fast food restaurants.) In schools that had dropped the Lunch Program, 58 percent of the children who bought their lunches spent more than 76¢.

Since low income children depend on the School Lunch Program for one-third to one-half of their daily intake, it is disturbing to see that over one-third of the children who no longer eat a school lunch are low income and three-fifths of those who no longer eat a school breakfast are low income. Non-participation in these programs, combined with cuts in the Food Stamp Program and other programs that help poor families to survive financially, can only have a negative impact on many children's nutritional status.

Moreover, according to our survey of selected schools, eating a school lunch made a difference in the kinds of foods eaten. Many more school lunch participants drank milk, ate a fruit, and ate a vegetable than non-school lunch participants or than students who were in a school that had dropped the School Lunch Program. Since these three foods are major sources of essential nutrients, the school lunch eaters are probably fulfilling more of their nutritional needs than the non-school lunch eaters.

School lunch programs obviously need more financial assistance and the maintenance of existing subsidies. However, there is also a need for technical assistance. Among the schools in our survey who dropped the Lunch Program, the only argument made in favor of dropping the Program was cost. Therefore, one kind of necessary assistance is giving local school districts ideas and help in

cutting costs (through the methods some of them mention -- better meal-planning, merchandising the program, and improved commodity use, as well as others) and increasing student participation.

The other kind of assistance needed is better arguments to make in favor of maintaining the programs, and better ways to make those arguments. In the schools that dropped out, the arguments for maintaining the Program were good ones: the special nutritional needs of low income children, a concern about what the students would be eating instead of school lunch, etc., but those arguments did not carry the day. A combination of cost-saving and participation-increasing ideas, along with improved methods of making the case for the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs, could help many communities decide to continue serving lunch and breakfast to school children.

Acknowledgements

We wish to extend special thanks to Denise Dixon for her work on the literature review and to Martha Brady for her tireless coding of questionnaires.

The Impact of Child Nutrition Budget Cuts:
A Look at the States and Selected Local School Districts

I. The School Lunch and Breakfast Programs: Background Information.

History

The National School Lunch Program, enacted through the National School Lunch Act of 1946, is the parent of all other child nutrition programs. A federally assisted national lunch program fulfilled two very different needs. On the one hand, farmers wanted to increase consumption of their surplus commodities, and the Lunch Program was a good market for these foods. On the other hand, with the outbreak of World War II, the United States discovered that many of its draftees had nutrition-related health problems which prevented them from serving in the military. Through the Lunch Program, Congress sought to avoid similar problems in the future, creating the Program "as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children."

The School Breakfast Program was established as a pilot program by the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. This pilot program grew out of Congressional concern for poor children who came to school hungry and children who had to travel long distances to get to school. It was generally recognized that it is as difficult to teach a hungry child in the morning as it is in the afternoon, and that school breakfast and lunch together could make the difference between a high quality education for a child and a poor scholastic start in life. In 1975 Congress made School Breakfast a permanent program, and stated that the Program should be made available in all schools where it was needed to provide adequate nutrition.

Structure of Operations

On the national level, these programs are run by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the United States Department of Agriculture. FNS also has regional offices that are responsible for particular states. On the state level, the programs are usually run by the state education agency and administered by the State Child Nutrition Director. On the local level, school districts (through their school boards) are responsible for the programs.

All schools that want to operate either the School Lunch or School Breakfast Program are eligible as long as they are private non-profit schools with tuition less than $1,500 or public schools. The state cannot limit the number of participating schools or the number of children a school can serve. The only requirement is that the local school board must apply to the state and sign a contract making it accountable for program operations. Local school districts are not required by federal law to provide any financial assistance to the lunch or breakfast program, although many do. The schools can either prepare the meals themselves or contract the meal service responsibilities to community groups or to food service management companies. Meals can be served in classrooms, cafeterias, auditoriums, or other nearby buildings. Any child in a school with a lunch or breakfast program must be allowed to participate in it.

Meal Prices

In 1962, additional federal funds were authorized so that children who could not afford the full price of lunch would be able to receive free or reduced-price lunches. In 1970, Congress instituted uniform national income guidelines for free and reduced-price meals so that all children, regardless of family income, would be able to enjoy the benefits of a school lunch

program. Today, school breakfasts and lunches are either "free," "reduced-price" or "paid".

"Free" meals are free to children whose families meet the income eligibility guideline of 130% of the poverty line. The cost of the free meal is paid entirely by the federal government, at least in theory. (School districts and states may supplement the federal reimbursement.) The cost of "reduced-price" or "paid" meals is shared between USDA and the child's family. "Reduced-price" children (whose family incomes are between 130% and 185% of the poverty line) pay 40¢ for a lunch and 30¢ for a breakfast. The cost of "paid" meals (charged to students whose families earn over 185% of the poverty line) varies from school to school. Thus, the amount of money a child pays for lunch or breakfast depends on his or her family's income and size, and some portion of the cost of every meal served is paid by USDA.* (See Appendix A for current reimbursement rates and eligibility guidelines. These rates of reimbursement and eligibility guidelines are updated annually to reflect increases in the cost of food and the cost of living over the previous year.)

Meal Pattern Requirements

In order for a school to receive federal reimbursement, it must serve children certain broad categories of food and specific amounts of food within these categories. These kinds and quantities of food have been selected to approximate 1/4 (at breakfast) and 1/3 (at lunch) of a child's Recommended

---

*In addition, schools receive 11.5¢ in donated commodities (agricultural products such as flour, poultry, cheese, etc.) for every lunch they serve.

Dietary Allowances* over time. The school or school district determines the menu based on these general meal pattern requirements.

The minimum LUNCH that a school can serve is:

° 1/2 pint unflavored fluid lowfat milk, skim milk or buttermilk;

° 2 oz. (edible portion as served) of lean meat, poultry or fish;

OR

° 2 oz. of cheese or 1 egg;

OR

° 1/2 cup of cooked dry beans or peas;

OR

° 4 tablespoons of peanut butter or an equivalent of any combination of the aforementioned foods;

° 3/4 cup serving consisting of two or more vegetables or fruits or both (full strength vegetable or fruit juice may meet one-half of this requirement);

° 8 servings of "bread" per week — a serving of bread may be: 1 slice whole-grain enriched bread or a serving of cornbread, biscuits, rolls, muffins, etc., made of whole-grain or enriched meal or flour; or 1/2 cup of cooked whole-grain or enriched rice, macaroni, noodles, other whole-grain or enriched pasta products, or other cereal grains such as bulgur or corn grits.

---

*The Recommended Dietary Allowances are the levels of intake of essential nutrients considered to be adequate to meet the known nutritional needs of of nearly all healthy persons.

The minimum BREAKFAST that a school can serve is:

° 1/2 pint fluid milk;

° 1/2 cup fruit or full-strength fruit or vegetable juice;

° 1 slice whole-grain or enriched bread or an equivalent serving of corn-bread, biscuits, rolls, muffins, etc., or 3/4 cup serving of cereal; and, as often as possible:

° protein-rich foods such as an egg, a one-ounce serving of meat, poultry, fish, cheese, or two tablespoons of peanut butter.

Junior high and elementary schools may implement a system called "offer v. serve" if they wish. (Senior high schools must implement this system.) Offer v. serve means that children may reject up to two of the items in the lunch, yet the school will still be reimbursed for the entire meal. This provision was put into law to reduce waste and save money, although many would argue that a more effective approach would be to expand needed nutrition education services.

Participation in the School Breakfast and Lunch Programs

Before the budget cuts made in 1981, 94,000 schools (more than 90% of the nation's eligible schools) serving 26 million children participated in the National School Lunch Program, and 35,000 schools serving 4 million children participated in the Breakfast Program. Forty-one percent of the lunches were "free" and 7.7% were "reduced price." Eighty-six percent of the breakfasts were "free".* Obviously the Lunch Program had expanded quite successfully nationwide. The major reasons for the Breakfast Program's slower progress were:

° It is a newer program.

---

*These figures are from April 1981 USDA statistics.

° Many affluent communities don't feel they need a breakfast program.

° Some communities or their officials have a philosophical resistance to the program -- i.e., "Children should eat at home."

° Some officials have misconceptions about the Program -- e.g., it costs the local district money, or it inevitably interferes with bus schedules or the school day.

Participation by students in the lunch and breakfast programs is affected by numerous variables: whether there is an "open campus" policy that allows students to leave at lunch-time; the kind of food that is served and its quality and quantity; advanced publication of menus; the availability of alternatives to school meals; the proximity of home to school; transportation arrangements; atmosphere of the lunchroom; length of lunch line; presence of "a la carte" lines or vending machines; whether choices are offered within the school lunch; student involvement in meal planning; and the meal preparation and delivery system (i.e., on-site preparation of food versus frozen convenience items). Price has always played some role in whether middle class students participate, but because of recent federal budget cuts, it is playing more of a role than ever. Also, changes in the application and eligibility requirements (described further in the next section) are also playing more of a role in determining participation levels by low income students.

II. Why This Study Was Done

During the 1981 legislative session (which set budget levels for fiscal year 1982), severe and unprecedented cuts were made in all of the child nutrition programs. The School Breakfast Program was cut by 20 percent ($80 million), the School Lunch Program by 30 percent (or $1 billion), the Child Care Food Program* by 30 percent, the Summer Food Program by 50 percent* and the Special Milk Program* by over 80 percent. In the case of the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs which are the focus of this report, the cuts were made by changing eligibility rules and reimbursement rates for free and reduced-price meals and by decreasing the subsidy for students paying the full price of school meals. This meant, for example, that many children who had received free lunches would no longer be eligible for them, and would have to pay 40¢ for a reduced-price lunch. Also, many children previously eligible for reduced-price lunches would have to pay the full price, which in some cases was a jump from 40¢ to as much as $1.25 per lunch per child. Moreover, since schools would receive 33 1/3 percent less for every lunch they served to a "full price" child, they had to make up that money somehow, most likely by increasing the cost of the lunch to the child.

Other changes in the law, beyond these basic cuts, affected the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs. Changes were made in the applications that

---

*The Child Care Food Program provides meals to preschool children in day care centers and family day care homes. The Summer Food Program provides lunches to low income children during the summer months. The Special Milk Program subsidizes milk for low income children.

parents fill out to receive free and reduced price meals for their children, including a requirement that the social security number of every adult in the family be included in the application, and new income verification requirements. These changes confused and frightened many parents, leading to drops in participation by low income children. In addition, the Food Service Equipment Assistance Program was ended, which had subsidized part of the cost of kitchen equipment or its repair in low income school districts all over the country.

During the time that these cuts and changes were being considered by Congress, massive numbers of telegrams, telephone calls, and letters were sent by parents, teachers, and members of various organizations concerned with adequate funding for child nutrition. Countless witnesses at Congressional hearings talked about the damage these cuts would do to the school meals programs, particularly the cut in the subsidy for full price students. School food service directors from local lunch programs painstakingly described the decision-making process their school boards would have to go through when they saw less money for lunches coming in from the federal government. If schools raised the prices for lunches, many middle class children would drop out, the directors argued, thus leaving most school lunches programs in a terrible fiscal situation -- with less money and less volume. Other directors stated that because their boards were so strapped financially, any drop in federal subsidy for lunch would lead to immediate consideration of dropping the program from the school district. The message was clear, but the child nutrition programs were cut anyway as part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981.

Another significant event occurred after the federal budget cuts became law. USDA attempted to cut <u>local</u> school lunch costs by propcsing regulations

in September 1981 to reduce the amount and quality of the food that schools would have to serve in the School Lunch Program -- the so-called "ketchup-as-a-vegetable" regulations. Because of the great public outcry against them, and extensive and biting media coverage, the regulations were withdrawn. These proposed regulations revealed that although the Administration insisted in its testimony before Congress that the child nutrition cuts would not lead to large drop-outs by schools and children, they felt obliged to try something rather drastic to save money for local school districts. (Unfortunately, these regulations may have led some parents to believe that their children were, in fact, going to receive less food of lower quality in exchange for more money -- not an encouragement for continuing to participate in the program.)

This series of of legislative and regulatory events set a fairly grim stage for school lunch during the 1981-1982 school year. At the same time that food and labor costs were rising, school food service directors and school boards were faced with fewer dollars available to operate their programs and fewer children willing or able to participate. They had to begin making some decisions: raise the cost of school meals to paying children? cut back on the amount and quality of what they served? drop the breakfast program? close their cafeterias altogether?

FRAC staff heard from local school food service workers and directors, state child nutrition directors, local parents' groups, and anti-hunger groups about the problems brewing nationwide. Some schools faced extraordinary fiscal problems, others seemed to be panicking beyond reason, and some state and local governments were exacerbating the difficult situations schools faced by withdrawing local and state subsidies as a result of still other budget cuts.

by withdrawing local and state subsidies as a result of still other budget cuts.

It was apparent that the cuts made in 1981 were only the beginning, and that more cuts in these same programs would be proposed in future years. Over the next several years, the impact of these cuts would have a continuous effect, in some places immediately, in other places in a year's time or in two years. It seemed to be a wise idea to begin to look at the immediate impact of the cuts on states, selected school districts, and the students in those school districts. Moreover, it was necessary to understand how it was that some schools managed to stay in the program, while others dropped out immediately, and what could be done to help schools and students continue participation in the School Lunch Program. FRAC staff felt that this kind of information would be useful to state and local officials who were working to maintain this vitally important child nutrition program. (See Appendix B for newspaper articles describing problems with some of the 1981 legislative changes in the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs.)

III. Methodology

The first step of the process was a brief review of the available literature, attempting to answer the following questions:

- What are the nutritional problems of American school children?
- What is the nutritional content of the school lunch?
- What is the impact of the school lunch on American children's nutritional intake?
- What are the available alternatives to school lunch, and how well do these alternatives match the nutritional content of a school lunch?
- What is the effect of the School Lunch Program on children's ability to learn?
- How does the cost of a school lunch affect participation levels?

There were three major purposes for doing the literature review: (1) to provide local decision-makers access to the results of more sophisticated analyses of the School Lunch Program; (2) to help develop questionnaires on the impact of budget cuts on child nutrition programs; and (3) to be able to place the results in a meaningful context that would facilitate their interpretation.

Based on the literature review and discussion among staff and with advocates and others around the country, we decided to attempt to answer the following questions with our study through the use of a series of questionnaires:

- Looking at the present national picture: how many schools have dropped out of the Lunch Program since September 1981; how many and what income levels of children are no longer participating in the Program; which areas of the country have been hardest hit by the drop-out of programs and children; what reasons do administrators give for school

and student drop-out; and what have states done to maintain participation by schools and students?

- ° Looking in-depth at selected schools that have chosen to drop out of the Lunch Program: Why are they dropping out? What is the impact on students when schools drop out?
- ° Looking in-depth at selected schools that have maintained the National School Lunch Program: What changes have they made in order to adjust to the cuts in federal support, while continuing to maintain participation levels and the nutritional integrity of the school lunch? If they have had significant decreases in participation by students, what is the impact on those students?
- ° What lessons can be learned from the study results that will help local and state decision-makers and parents work together to continue to meet their children's nutritional needs?

With questions in hand, staff met with an expert on questionnaires and study design to discuss the kinds of questions to ask, of whom to ask them, the format of the questions and questionnaires and the study design. We agreed that the study would be descriptive in nature, rather than statistical, because of our interests and our limitations.

Based on our discussions, we developed a series of questionnaires and a protocol for the study which we shared with a "blue ribbon committee" of local and state food service directors, local and state anti-hunger advocates, and our survey expert. Based on their responses, we extensively revised the questionnaires and the protocol.

The next step was to contact anti-hunger advocates -- one in each state -- who would see that the state child nutrition director questionnaires were

completed. We also contacted anti-hunger advocates in each of 27 states who were willing to survey local schools concerning the impacts on child nutrition budget cuts.

The following questionnaires were developed. (See Appendix C for the Study Procedures and Appendix D for the actual questionnaires.):

State Survey

State Child Nutrition Director Questionnaire: This went to all state directors via an anti-hunger advocate/interviewer within the state who delivered it with a cover letter written by FRAC, an explanation of the study, and a stamped, addressed envelope in which to return the completed questionnaire to FRAC. The interviewers were asked to call the director in a week after delivery to make sure that the questionnaire had been filled out and mailed, to answer any questions, and to replace the questionnaire if necessary. (Non-complying interviewers were reminded at least two times to return the questionnaires, once by telephone and once by letter.)

Selected School District Survey

Schools that have maintained the Lunch Program: Participating anti-hunger advocates chose one elementary school and one secondary school in their state that had maintained the Lunch Program. We encouraged them to look for schools that had sought particularly creative or innovative ways to stay in the program.

Questionnaires done in both the elementary and secondary school:

° School Food Service Director

° 4th Grade Class (Student Questionnaire-Y)

OR

° 10th Grade Class (Student Questionnaire-O)

° School Description Form

Schools That Have Dropped the School Lunch Program: We asked the same 27 anti-hunger advocates to choose one elementary and one secondary school in their state that had dropped the School Lunch Program since last year.

Questionnaires to be done in both the elementary and secondary school:

° 4th Grade Class (Student Questionnaire-Y) and their teacher

OR

° 10th Grade Class (Student Questionnaire-O) and their homeroom teacher

° School Description Form

° Former School Food Service Director

° School Nurse

° Principal

The anti-hunger advocates were sent packets of all the questionnaires they needed, including stamped, addressed envelopes. They were encouraged to call us with any questions they had. They had, on the average, 7 weeks to complete the selected school study in their states, and 2 1/2 months for the state director's questionnaire. They were reminded at least two times concerning the need to complete the school questionnaires after they received them, once by telephone and once by mail. Completed questionnaires were received, coded, compiled and analyzed at FRAC.

IV. Literature Review

A. What are the nutritional problems of American school children?

Several studies have been conducted which provide valuable information regarding the nutritional status of the nation's children. Two major surveys, the Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (HANES) (National Center for Health Statistics, 1974) and the Ten State Nutrition Survey (TSNS) (USHEW, 1972), studied several thousand school children from all income levels. They looked at children's actual diets, biochemical tests of nutritional status, clinical indicators of malnutrition and growth measures. The other major study, the Nationwide Food Consumption Survey (NFCS) (USDA, SEA, 1980), collected information relating to nutrient intake alone.

Dietary Information

The results of TSNS, HANES, and NFCS all show that children from low-income households consume fewer calories than those from families with higher incomes. (For example, in the TSNS, the energy intake of 10-16 year olds was consistently lower for both low income males and females.) Similar observations were reported by Lee (1978), studying low income teen-agers in Kentucky, and by Frank (1977), studying adolescents in Louisiana. Considering this data on energy intake, it is not surprising that Lowe (1975) suggests that the diets of poor children are often deficient in nutrients because of the inadequate quantity of food consumed, rather than the nutritional quality of the food.

Inadequate intakes of other nutrients have also been reported in the literature. Low vitamin A intakes have been reported for low income children (Myers 1968), and Kirksey (1978) found low Vitamin A intakes in 69% of 12-14 year old females. The TSNS reported low intakes of vitamin C in low income

children (USHEW, 1972), as did Hampton (1967). Black children have been reported to have lower riboflavin intakes than white children (USHEW, 1972; Lopez, 1980). Low vitamin B_6 and folacin intakes have been found in teen-age girls (USDA, SEA, 1980). Low intakes of calcium have been reported in girls over age 12 (USDA, SEA, 1980; Kirksey, 1978; Lee, 1978).

Low iron intakes have been consistently reported. HANES (National Center for Health Statistics, 1974) showed that teen-agers between 12 and 17 years, regardless of sex, had low iron intakes. Data from the TSNS also showed that 80% of 10 to 16 year olds had inadequate iron intakes (USHEW, 1972). The Nationwide Food Consumption Survey (USDA, SEA, 1980) reported similar findings in teen-age girls aged 15 to 18 years.

Clinical Indicators and Biochemical Measures

Although studies have shown that the diets of some children and teen-agers do not always provide all of the essential nutrients, severe deficiency diseases such as pellagra (niacin deficiency) and beri-beri (thiamin deficiency) are rarely found in the U.S. The major deficiency disease that is consistently reported is iron-deficiency anemia. There is much controversy surrounding adequate ways to classify iron status, but most physicians and nutritionists agree that iron deficiency anemia is one of the major nutrition-related problems found among U.S. children.

There are, however, a few reports of other nutrient deficiencies which have shown up in biochemical tests. The TSNS (USHEW, 1972) reported low urinary riboflavin in low income children. Van deMark and Wright (1972) found low blood levels of folate among pregnant teenage girls. Low serum vitamin C levels were seen in Black children in Kentucky (Lee, 1978). Thirty to 50 percent of the Texas Spanish-American children studied by TSNS (USHEW, 1972) had

inadequate blood levels of vitamin A. Nevertheless, the results of biochemical tests, often used to measure nutritional status, do not show school children suffering from major nutritional deficiencies, except in the case of iron.

Growth Measures

On the other hand, poor growth and development have been shown to be a serious problem among some children, especially low income children. For example, the TSNS (USHEW, 1972) showed that children from low income families were more frequently underweight, and the Center for Disease Control's Nutrition Surveillance Program (Nichaman and Lane, 1979) has found low height for age in 10% of the school children examined. Poor growth can be an indicator of chronic undernutrition.

B. What is the Nutritional Content of the School Lunch?

Nutritional Content As Served

The nutrient content of the school lunch is supposed to approximate one-third of the Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDA) over time. Several studies have assessed the nutritional content of the school lunch as served to determine if the goal of one-third of the RDA is met. A USDA survey of 300 schools showed that the lunches met or exceeded one-third of the RDA's except for magnesium, calories, iron, and vitamin B_6 (Murphy, 1968, 1969, 1970). The General Accounting Office (Comptroller General, 1977) analyzed lunches from schools in New York City, Los Angeles, and Cleveland. Their results showed that the lunches fell below one-third of the RDA for vitamin A, iron, zinc, magnesium, and calcium. In other studies of school lunches, calories (USDA, FNS, 1979) and thiamin (Head, 1973) were below the one-third RDA goal. The most recent nationwide study by the General Accounting Office (1981) of high school lunches found that none of the lunches provided one-third of the RDA

for folacin, vitamins A and C, iron, magnesium and zinc. (The variation in these results may be attributable to the broad flexibility schools have in deciding which foods to serve in their school lunch menus.)

Nutritional Content As Consumed

Providing one-third of the RDA on the lunch tray is one thing; the actual consumption of those nutrients is quite another. For many reasons, some children will not eat all of the food served. In a 1979 USDA study (USDA, FNS, 1979) elementary and secondary school lunches as consumed failed to meet the RDA for iron, thiamin, and calories. Similar findings were also reported by Jansen (1975) who studied fifth and tenth grade students. In a survey conducted in North Carolina, lunches as consumed were low in calories, ascorbic acid, iron and thiamin (Mead, 1973). Niacin has also been reported as low in lunches as consumed (Price, 1975).

C. What is the impact of the School Lunch Program on children's nutritional intake?

Despite the fact that school lunches do not always meet the nutritional goal of 1/3 of the Recommended Dietary Allowances, they still make a substantial contribution to the total daily nutrient intake of some children (Price, 1978). In Price's study, lunches consumed by school lunch participants were more likely to meet the RDA for most nutrients when compared to the lunches of non-participants. The TSNS (USHEW, 1972) found that school lunch made a larger contribution to the daily nutrient intake of low income children than it did to the diets of higher income children. Price found the same thing in 1975. In a study of school lunch participants from low-income households, school lunches contributed 34 to 49 percent of the day's intake for calories and 12 nutrients (USDA, SEA, 1981). Finally, Howe and Vaden (1980), studying

10th and 11th grade students, found that school lunch participants had better diets than non-participants. They observed that students eating school lunches were more likely to consume one-third or more of the RDA for nutrients than students who did not participate in the school lunch program.

D. What are the available alternatives to school lunch, and how well do these alternatives match the nutritional content of a school lunch?

Bag Lunch

One major alternative is the bag lunch from home. If well-planned, bag lunches could be just as nutritious as the school lunch. But for many children bag lunches may be inadequate because their families do not have the time, financial resources, or the know-how to prepare an equally nutritious lunch.

Two studies have examined the nutrient content of bag lunches as compared to school lunches. A study of school and bag lunches consumed by elementary school children in Upstate New York reported that school lunches provided significantly higher levels of all major nutrients with the exception of calories and niacin (Emmons, 1972). These differences were most pronounced in protein, calcium, vitamin A, riboflavin, and vitamin C. In a Massachusetts study, Stalker (1971) reported that the school lunch was more nutritious than bag lunches. Of the 80,000 children surveyed, 72 percent of the students eating a school lunch had nutritionally adequate lunches, while only 42 percent of the bag lunches eaten were nutritionally adequate.

"A la carte"

Another alternative to the school lunch is the "a la carte" lunch, where food items are sold separately and the student is allowed to choose any item or items. Obviously the nutritional quality of a lunch made up of a la carte items would depend on the kinds of foods available and the food habits of the

students. However, considering what is generally available on a la carte lines (a preponderance of snack foods and a lack of fruits and vegetables), one would speculate that most "a la carte lunches" are nutritionally inferior to the school lunch. Jansen (1980) looked at a "free choice" lunch program compared to the traditional program. However, the free choices all consisted of traditional school lunch items: one entree, one milk beverage, three vegetable-fruit items, two bread or cereal items, and one dessert. (A minimum lunch was a single menu item). Even when provided with "good" choices, vitamin A, vitamin C and iron levels as consumed were at marginal levels. Jansen points out that "students in most need of nutritionally well-balanced lunch would be the ones most likely to select and consume nutritionally less adequate lunches." A study of a military feeding program (Shakenberg, 1976) showed that military personnel buying a la carte lunches consumed lower intakes of calories, protein, iron, thiamin, ascorbic acid, and vitamin A than personnel eating traditional meals.

"Fast Food"

Another alternative to school lunches is the fast food restaurant. The nutritional adequacy of fast foods such as that served at McDonald's is reported to be similar to the same food prepared at home but at twice the price (Isom, 1976). Consumer Reports (May, 1975) evaluated meals from eight major fast food chains and found that they were deficient in six nutrients: biotin, folacin, vitamin A, iron, copper, and pantothenic acid.

Vending Machines

Sometimes foods sold in vending machines and student stores make up a child's lunchtime intake. Usually these foods include potato chips, candy bars, fruit-flavored drinks, etc. These foods provide some nutrients beyond

calories, but a lunch made up of them cannot compete nutritionally with a school lunch.

Finally, while some children may have alternatives to school lunches, other children simply will not eat during the lunch period if no school lunches are available. As stated earlier, school lunches often provide children with more than one-third of the day's nutrient intake (USDA, SEA, 1980). If this meal is consistently missed, it will be difficult for a child to meet his or her nutritional needs. For growing children whose diets may already be inadequate, being deprived of additional nutrients because they do not eat lunch could have serious ramifications, not only on their physical health but also on their emotional stability and ability to learn.

E. What is the effect of the school lunch on a child's ability to learn?

Deficiencies of specific nutrients have been shown to affect behavior and school performance. Low iron intake has been shown to alter cognitive processes, thus interfering with successful school achievement (Pollitt and Lewis, 1980). Webb and Oski (1973) have also reported an association between iron deficiency anemia and both low school achievement and misbehavior. A study of a group of Cleveland teen-agers with marginal thiamin deficiency (reportedly as a result of a high consumption of "junk" foods) found them to have undergone personality changes and to have experienced depression and severe headaches (Lonsdale and Shamberg, 1980).

Studies of the effects of nutrition programs, particularly the Breakfast Program, on school performance and behavior suggest that school meals do have a positive effect on learning. The validity of these studies is often questioned because of inadequate testing procedures, poor study design, and teacher bias, but the results cannot be completely discounted. Hunger, especially

during the morning, has been shown to increase the nervousness of elementary school children, and was reduced by mid-morning milk breaks (Baird, 1931). Some forty years later Matheson (1970) reported that a morning food supplement had a beneficial effect on school children's performance. Pinkus (1970) observed that children participating in the school breakfast program had fewer episodes of restlessness and crying spells than children who did not participate in the breakfast program. Classroom responsiveness has been reported to be higher for children participating in both the school breakfast and the lunch program, than for children eating only the school lunch (Koonce, 1972).

F. How does the cost of school lunch affect participation levels?

Several studies have been done over the last 20 years that show an inverse relationship between the price charged for a "paid" meal and participation in the National School Lunch Program, starting with Kriesberg (1964), who reported a national survey carried out in 1962, and Freund (1971), reporting a national survey completed in 1971.

During the 1970-1971 school year, West and Hoppe (1973) studied the relationship between price and participation in Washington State's School Lunch Program and Nicholson (1973) studied this relationship in the North Carolina schools.

West and Hoppe looked at the relationship between the average price for 1970-1971 and the average participation rate in 272 public school districts. This is a cross-sectional study, as the relationship between price and participation were studied during a single time period, rather than before and after an actual price increase. They found a significant inverse relationship between price and participation, and suggested that lower prices might increase student participation. Nicholson's study was also cross-sectional, in 12

school administrative units. The inverse relationship existed for elementary, junior high and high schools, but was only statistically significant for elementary schools.

Braley and Nelson (1975) looked at the actual effect of a price increase in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1973, from 20¢ to an average price of 46.67¢ (a very high increase due to a pull-out of local subsidies). The number of students participating dropped by 62.8% from January to February (when the change was made), and it was found that very few students who dropped out returned to the lunch program as "free" students or as "paid" students, when February statistics were compared to May. (More than 50% of Pittsburgh's students were receiving free meals.)

Braley (1976) also looked at the effect of February 1976 price increases of 20 percent in lunch (40 to 50¢ for elementary and 50 to 60¢ for secondary) and 50 percent in breakfast (20-30¢ for elementary and secondary), which were made in Fairfax County, Virginia. (This is one of the most affluent counties in the U.S., with free and reduced price meal participation at less than 10%.) School lunch participation dropped 14.2% from January to February, but recovered 1/3 of the initial loss (making it a drop of 9.7%) in April. However, school breakfast participation dropped 33.4% from January to February and decreased further by April. (There were no increases in free lunch or free breakfasts with the increase in price for "paid" breakfasts and lunches.) The author concludes that paid breakfasts are more responsive to price increases than paid lunches, and that there is an inverse relationship between the price of lunch and participation, though some recovery does occur in participation.

These last two studies may suggest that in a poorer area, recovery does not happen because families decide that they cannot afford to come back to the program, whereas in a more affluent area, a certain percentage decide they can. However, the proportionately larger percentage of price increase in Pittsburgh may have more to do with the continued drop in participation than family incomes.

Bibliography

Braley, George A., "School Lunch and Breakfast Program Price and Participation -- Fairfax County, Virginia," Unpublished manuscript, 1976.

Braley, George A. and Paul E. Nelson, Jr., "Effect of a Controlled Price Increase on School Lunch Participation: Pittsburgh 1973," Am. J. Agr. Econ. 57(1): 90, February 1975.

Comptroller General of the United States, Efforts To Improve School Lunch Programs — Are They Paying Off?, CED-81-121, General Accounting Office, 1981.

Comptroller General of the United States, The National School Lunch Program - Is It Working?, (PAD-77-6), General Accounting Office, 1977.

Consumer Reports, "How nutritious are fast food meals?", May, 1975, pg. 278.

Emmons, L., M. Hayes, and D. Call, "A study of school feeding programs," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 61:26, 1972.

Frank, G.C., et al., "Dietary studies of rural school children in a cardiovascular survey," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 71:31, 1977.

Hampton, M.C., et al., "Caloric and nutrient intakes of teen-agers," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 50: 385, 1967.

Head, M., et al., "Major nutrients in the type A lunch: Analyzed and calculated values as served," J. of Amer. Diet. Ass. 63:620, 1973.

Howe, S.M. and A.G. Vaden, "Factors differentiating participants and nonparticipants of the National School Lunch Program: I. Nutrient intake of high school students," J. of Am. Diet Ass. 76:451, 1980.

Isom, P., "Nutritive value and cost of fast food meals," Family Economics Review, Fall, 1976.

Jansen, G.R., et al, "Comparison of Type A nutritional standard menus for school lunch: III. Nutritive content of menus and acceptibility," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 66:254, 1975.

Jansen, G.R., et al, "Alternate lunch patterns in high schools: IV. Nutritive value," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 77:546, 1980.

Kirksey, A., et al., "Vitamin B_6 nutritional status of a group of female adolescents," Am. J. of Clin. Nut. 31:946, 1978.

Koonce, T.M., "Does breakfast help?," School Food Service Journal, 1972, pp. 51-54.

Laird, D.A., M. Levitan, and V.A. Wilson, "Nervousness in school children as related to hunger and diet," Medical Journal of Research 134:494, 1931.

Lee, C.J., "Nutritional status of selected teen-agers in Kentucky," Am. J. of Clin. Nut. 31:1453, 1978.

Lonsdale, D. and R. Shamberger, "Marginal thiamin deficiency in adolescents," Am. J. of Clin. Nut. 33:205, 1980.

Lopez, R., et al., "Riboflavin deficiency in an adolescent population in New York City," Am. J. of Clin. Nut. 33:1283, 1980.

Lowe, C.U., et al., "Reflections on dietary studies with children in the Ten State Nutrition Survey of 1968-1970," Pediatrics 56:320, 1975.

Matheson, N.E., Mid-morning nutrition and its effects on school type tasks, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1970.

Murphy, E.W., et al., "Nutritive content of Type A school lunches," School Lunch Journal 22:11, 1968.

Murphy, E.W., et al., "Vitamin content of Type A school lunches," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 55:372, 1969.

Murphy, E.W., et al., "Major mineral elements in Type A school lunches," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 57:239, 1970.

Myers, M., et al., "A nutrition study of school children in a depressed urban district: I. Dietary intake findings and II. Physical and biochemical findings," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 53:226, 1968.

National Center for Health Statistics, Preliminary Findings of the first Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 1971-1972: Dietary intake and biochemical findings, Washington, D.C.: DHEW Pub. No. (HRA) 74-1219-1, 1974.

Nichaman, M.Z. and J.M. Lane, "Nutritional surveillance in developed countries: The United States Experience," In R.D. Alfin-Slater and D. Kritchevsky (Eds.), Human Nutrition—A Comprehensive Treatise, (Vol. 2), D.B. Jellife and E.F.P. Jellife (Eds.), Nutrition and Growth, New York: Plenum Publishing, 1979.

Nicholson, Robert H., "Some economic aspects of the National School Lunch Program in North Carolina," Economic Information Reports No. 32, July 1973.

Pinkus, M.S., "A study of breakfast habits and behavioral patterns in certain Louisiana elementary schools following implementation of the National School Breakfast Program," unpublished master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1970.

Pollitt, E. and N. Lewis, "Nutrition and educational achievement: Part I. Malnutrition and behavioral test indicators and Part II. Correlations between nutritional and behavioral test indicators within populations where malnutrition is not a major public health problem," Food and Nutrition Bulletin vol. 2, no. 3 and 4, 1980.

Price, D.W., et al., Final report: Evaluation of school lunch and school breakfast programs in the state of Washington, (Parts I and II), Pullman, Washington, Washington State University, 1975.

Price, D.W., et al., "Food delivery programs and other factors affecting nutrient intake of children," Am. J. Agr. Econ., pp. 609-618, 1978.

Schakenberg, D.D., "The impact of novel military feeding systems on dining hall attendance, plate waste, food selection, and nutrient intake," presented at the National Conference of School Lunch Program Directors, El Paso, Texas, Dec. 1976.

Stalker, J.C., Massachusetts Public School Survey, Department of Education, Massachusetts, 1971.

USDA, Food and Nutrition Service, Food Consumption and Nutrition Evaluation: The National School Lunch Program, Washington, D.C., 1979.

USDA, SEA, Food and Nutrient Intakes of Individuals in One Day in the United States, Spring, 1977. (Nationwide Food Consumption Survey, 1977-1978, Preliminary Report, No. 2), Hyattsville, MD: Consumer Nutrition Center, 1980.

USDA, SEA, The National School Lunch Program and Diets of Participants from Low-Income Households, Hyattsville, MD: Consumer Nutrition Center, 1981.

USHEW, Health and Mental Services Administration, Center for Diease Control, The Ten State Nutritional Survey, 1968-1970, DHEW Publication No. (HSM) 72-8130, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Van de Mark, M.S. and A.C. Wright, "Hemoglobin and folate levels of pregnant teen-agers," J. of Am. Diet. Ass. 61:511, 1972.

Webb, T.E. and F. Oski, "The effect of iron deficiency anemia on scholastic achievement, behavioral stability and perceptual sensitivity in adolescents," Pediatric Research 8:294, 1973.

West, Donald A. and Robert A. Hoppe, "Pricing and Participation Rates in the National School Lunch Programs in Washington Public School Districts," Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 784, October 1973.

V. Study Results

A. The States

Drop-out by Schools and Children From the Lunch Program

Forty-four states responded to the questionnaire. (See Appendix E for a list of responding states.) In thirty-three of them, schools had dropped out of the National School Lunch Program during the 1981-1982 school year. Of these thirty-three states, the major reasons state directors felt that schools dropped the Lunch Program are presented below:

Reasons	Number Mentioning This Reason
Decreased federal reimbursement	15
Decreased participation	2
School closing due to decreased enrollment	3
Private schools with high tuitions*	9
Inflation	1
Replacement by a la carte lines and competitive foods	3
Number of states not responding	9

In these thirty-three states with school drop-outs, state directors reported that the majority of the schools that had dropped out of the Lunch Program during the 1981-1982 school year fell into the following categories:

---

*Schools with tuition over $1,500 were eliminated from the Lunch Program during the 1981 legislative session.

Size of school	Number Listing This Category
Large	5
Small	16
Location of school	
Rural	9
Urban	5
Suburban	7
Grade level of school	
Elementary	12
Middle	5
Secondary	12
Income level of student in the school	
Majority poor	1
Majority non-poor	17
Characteristics of schools that have dropped vary so much, cannot fit them into particular categories	2
Don't know	7

Number of Title I Schools that Dropped Out	Number of States Reporting This Number
0	14
1-7	9

Forty-two state directors answered that children in their states had dropped out of the Lunch Program in the 1981-1982 school year. (Only two said that no children had dropped out.) The major reasons the directors felt that children had dropped out of the Lunch Program are presented below:

Reasons	Number Mentioning This Reason
Increase in price of lunch	24
New income eligibility guidelines	7
Adverse publicity for Lunch Program; bad public image	4
Changes in application procedures	3
Decreased family income	2
Schools have lower enrollments	2
Competition of a la carte lines and fast food restaurants	2
No answer given	3

State directors were also asked to provide figures on daily school lunch participation by students and schools in the 1980-81 and 1981-82 school years. (The figures were based on average participation during January, February, and March unless otherwise noted. State child nutrition directors collect data in different ways. Therefore, it was not always possible to get uniform figures.) The following tables show the percentages of schools and students that dropped out of the National School Lunch Program in the 40 states responding to this question. (See Appendix F for the actual numbers.)

School Lunch Program

Percentage change between 1980-81 and 1981-82

State	Total Lunches	Paid Lunches	Reduced Price Lunches	Free Lunches	Number of Participating Schools
Alaska**	+ 3.3%	+ 7.1%	+ 1 %	- 4.2%	+12.6%
Arizona (Arizona figures compare January 1981 and September 1981)	-25 %	-30 %	-38 %	-15 %	- 6 %
Arkansas	-15 %	-15.3%	-14.5%	-14.7%	No answer
California	- 9 %	-24 %	- 7.7%	+ 1.3%	- 7.1%*
Colorado	-10.9%	- 8.5%	-22.2%	-12.7%	No change
Connecticut[2]	-13.6%	- 7.2%	-11 %	- 9.2%	- 9.9%
Delaware[2]	-15.9%	-21.8%	-16.3%	- 8 %	-10.4%
Florida	- 9.6%	- 9.4%	-15 %	- 8.6%	Less than 1%
Georgia[1]	- 5.3%	- 5.0%	- 4.1%	- 5.9%	No answer
Hawaii	- 2.1%	No answer	No answer	No answer	No change
Idaho	+ 2.3%	- 3.6%	- 2.6%	+20.4%	- 2.8%
Indiana	-11.1%	-11.1%	-11.1%	-10.9%	No answer
Iowa (Iowa figures compare 1980-81 with January 1982.)	-10.7%	-11.1%	-19 %	- 6.3%	- 1.8%
Kentucky[3]	- 2.4%	- 2 %	- 7.5%	- 1.9%	- 1.6%
Maine	-14.8%	-12.6%	-23.2%	-14.1%	- 2.4%***

* Some public school districts have come under agreements of neighboring districts.

** The state took over Bureau of Indian Affairs schools; thus the participation increase. Where programs already existed, the number participating dropped.

*** The decrease here is due only to consolidations and closings.

1 These states compared October 1980 and October 1981.
2 These states compared November 1980 and November 1981.
3 These states compared March 1981 and March 1982.

School Lunch Program
Percentage change between
1980-81 and 1981-82
(Continued)

State	Total Lunches	Paid Lunches	Reduced Price Lunches	Free Lunches	Number Participating Schools
Maryland	-24.4%	-29 %	-48.5%	-11.2%	- 4.1%
Michigan[1]	-12.1%	-21.3%	-19.4%	+ 5.1%	No answer
Minnesota	-14.9%	-14.1%	-17.1%	(in free and reduced meals combined)	- 4.1%
Mississippi	-11.5%	No anaswer	No answer	No answer	Less than 1%
Missouri[3]	-14.4%	-19.2%	-16.9%	- 4.9%	- 2.3%
Montana	- 8 %	- 5.8%	-20.2%	-10.8%	Less than 1%
Nebraska	-14.2%	-16 %	-16.1%	- 7 %	- 3.2%
Nevada	- 4.6%	-17 %	-25 %	-24.2%	No answer
New Hampshire	-23.9%	-23.1%	-48.7%	-14.6%	No answer
New Jersey	-14.3%	-15.4%	- 6.4%	-14.3%	- 8.9%
New Mexico	-11.5%	- 4.3%	- 9.5%	-13.7%	+ 1 %
North Dakota	+ 7.7%	+12 %	- 5.9%	- 3.7%	+ 9.8%*
Oregon	-10.3%	-12.3%	-22 %	- 3 %	-37.8%
Pennsylvania[4]	-24.1%	-23.5%	-40.8%	-20.9%	- 8.9%

* Large increase in private schools participating in School Lunch Program.

1 These states compared October 1980 and October 1981.

2 These states compared November 1980 and November 1981.

3 These states compared March 1981 and March 1982.

School Lunch Program
Percentage change between
1980-81 and 1981-82
(Continued)

State	Total Lunches	Paid Lunches	Reduced Price Lunches	Free Lunches	Number Participating Schools
Rhode Island[1]	-19.9%	-32.9%	-39.9%	- 5.8%	-11.3%
South Carolina	- 5.3%	- 0 %	-13 %	- 8.4%	No change
(South Carolina figures compare Jan.-Feb. 1981 with Jan.-Feb. 1982)					
South Dakota	- 9.2%	- 9.3%	-18.8%	- 5.4%	- 3 %
Texas	- 6.8%	- 2.9%	-17.1%	- 8.7%	+ 1.8%
Utah	-11.8%	- 9.3%	-34 %	- 9.8%	No change
Vermont	-19.7%	-20.1%	-31.4%	-14.9%	- 5.7%
Virginia[3]	-13.2%	-17.3%	- 4.9%	- 8.2%	+ 2.2%
Washington, D.C.	-17.1%	-22.5%	-16.2%	(free and reduced price lunches combined)	No answer
Washington[1]	-25 %	-28 %	-30 %	-10 %	No answer
West Virginia[2]	-12 %	-16.6%	+ 1 %	- 9.9%	No answer
Wyoming[4]	- 5.5%	- 3.6%	-27 %	- 4.7%	- 1.7%

* Large increase in private schools participating in School Lunch Program.

1 These states compared October 1980 and October 1981.

2 These states compared November 1980 and November 1981.

3 These states compared March 1981 and March 1982.

4 These states compared January 1981 and January 1982

The following chart groups the states according to the percentage of students who dropped out of the Lunch Program. (Seven percent had increased student participation):

% of Drop in Total Student Participation	% of States in This Category
0 - 5%	15%
6 - 10%	15%
11 - 15%	40%
16 - 20%	10%
21 - 25%	12%

Overall, the 40 states that responded to this question had lost 1,861,409 total children from the Lunch Program: 63 percent paid lunches and 37 percent reduced price and free. (That means that over one-third of the drop in participation is by low income children.) If we compare this drop with USDA's April 1981 total Lunch Program participation figures, we can see that at least* 7% of the Lunch Program participants have been lost.

Thirty-one state directors responded to the question regarding numbers of participating schools that dropped out of the Program. These states reported a loss of 799 schools*, the majority of them public. (According to USDA April 1981 figures, 93,998 schools participated in the Lunch Program during the 1980-81 school year.)

---

*This figure is based on the states from whom we have participation numbers. (It is also based on January, February and March averages unless otherwise noted.) Therefore, the true percentage drop is higher.

Drop-out by Schools and Children From the Breakfast Program

Thirty-two of the forty-four state directors responded that schools had dropped out of the Breakfast Program in the 1981-1982 school year. The major reasons directors in these thirty-two states felt that schools dropped the Breakfast Program are presented below:

Reasons	Number Mentioning This Reason
Decreased participation	11
School board opposition to the Program; not a priority	6
Increasing costs	5
Decreased federal reimbursement	5
Scheduling and staffing problems	4
Decided to concentrate on Lunch Program	2
New income eligibility guidelines	1
Don't know	12

In these thirty-two states with school drop-outs, directors stated that the majority of the schools that have dropped out of the Breakfast Program during the 1981-1982 school year fall into the following categories:

Size of school	Number Listing This Category
Large	2
Small	13

Location of school	
Rural	9
Urban	4
Suburban	7
Grade level of school	
Elementary	15
Middle	5
Secondary	7
Income level of student in the school	
Majority poor	4
Majority non-poor	6
Characteristics of schools that have dropped vary so much, can't fit them into particular categories	8
Don't know	13

Number of Title I Schools that Dropped Out	Number of States Mentioning This Number
0	5
1- 8	6
11-32	4
All	1

Thirty-five state directors answered that children in their states had dropped out of the Breakfast Program in the 1981-1982 school year. The major reasons the directors felt that children had dropped out of the Breakfast Program are presented below:

Reasons	This Reason
Increased price	26
New income eligibility guidelines	5
Changes in application procedures for free and reduced price breakfasts	3
Decreasing student enrollment	5
Schools dropping program	1
Don't know	11

Thirty-eight states provided figures on School Breakfast participation by students and schools in the 1980-81 and 1981-82 school years. (Figures were based on daily averages in January, February and March unless otherwise noted. as with school lunch figures, state directors do not collect data in uniform ways. The following tables show the percentages of schools and students that dropped out of the Program in the states responding to this question. (See Appendix F for actual numbers.)

School Breakfast Program

Percentage change between 1980-81 and 1981-82

State	Total Breakfasts	Paid Breakfasts	Reduced Price Breakfasts	Free Breakfasts	Number of Participating Schools
Alaska*	+ 6.3%	+10.5%	+10.1%	+ 7.1%	+52 %
Arkansas	-14.0%	-22.8%	-18.2%	-11.6%	No answer
California	- 5.4%	-61.9%	-12.9%	+ 3.9%	-13.9%
Colorado	-26.5%	-36.8%	-50.8%	-22.1%	- 8.8%
Connecticut[2]	-32.5%	-50.9%	-61.4%	-20.4%	-39.7%
Delaware[2]	-10.5%	-53.9%	-39.7%	+ 1.8%	-11.9%
Florida	-11.6%	- 7.2%	-37.1%	-26.3%	+ 6.8%
Hawaii	- 1.9%	No answer	No answer	No answer	No change
Idaho[2]	+25.6%	-33 %	-40.1%	+67.3%	- 9.1%**
Indiana	-38.6%	-50.9%	-52.9%	-33.3%	+ 1.2%
Iowa (Iowa figures compare 1980-81 with January 1982.)	-23.5%	-37 %	-56.1%	-14.1%	Less than 1% increase
Kentucky[3]	- 3.5%	-13.7%	-29.5%	+ 2.2%	- 1.3%
Maine	-23.9%	- 2 %	-38.5%	-22 %	-16.8%
Maryland	-29.9%	-44.1%	-73.8%	-18.4%	- 4.3%
Michigan[1]	+59.7%	+12.9%	-23.7%	+70.7%	No answer
Minnesota	-22.5%	-41.9%	-17.4% (free and reduced meals combined)		-13.5%
Mississippi	-14.8%	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer

* The state took over BIA schools; thus the participation increase. Where Programs already existed, the number particpating dropped.

**All private schools.

1 These states compared October 1980 and October 1981.

2 These states compared November 1980 and November 1981.

3 These states compared March 1981 and March 1982.

Missouri[3]	- 6.9%	-48.6%	-44.4%	Less than 1% decrease	Less than 1% decrease
Montana	-17 %	-39.6%	-29.3%	- 9.7%	- 3.1%
Nebraska	- 1.9%	-26.7%	-43.8%	-11.2%	-15.6% increase
New Hampshire	-41.8%	-62.9%	+ 8.6%	+ 9 %	No answer
New Jersey	-20.3%	-68.8%	-30.3%	-12.2%	-19.9%
New Mexico	-28.1%	-39.8%	-49.3%	-24.3%	-10.4%
Nevada	-24.1%	-23.1%	-60.3%	-22.3%	No answer
North Dakota	- 9.5%	- 8.6%	+11.2%	+32.3%	+18.2%
Oregon	+ 2 %	-55 %	-54 %	+14.7%	+ 4.3%
Pennsylvania[4]	-25.2%	-59.9%	-56.9%	-19.2%	-30.2%
Rhode Island[1]	-16.2%	-81.6%	-74.2%	- 7.5%	-29 %
South Carolina (South Carolina figures compare Jan.-Feb. 1981 with Jan.-Feb. 1982.)	-13.6%	-23 %	-28 %	-10.9%	Less than 1% increase
South Dakota	-22.4%	-50 %	-54 %	-12.5%	-11.1%
Texas	-13.4%	-14.7%	-44.4%	- 9.8%	+ 2 %
Utah	-29.3%	-51.8%	-69.9%	-21.7%	-17.6%
Vermont	-55.5%	-66.7%	-55.8%	-41.2%	-47.6%
Virginia[3]	-25.6%	+104.4%	-37.2%	-31 %	- 3.8%
Washington, D.C.	-20.6%	-17.5%	-64.5%	-19.1%	No answer
Washington[1]	-32.5%	-52.6%	-65.6%	-22.5%	No answer
*West Virginia[2]	+27.1%	+39.4%	-19.0%	+29.8%	No answer
Wyoming[4]	+18.6%	-19.5%	-21.8%	+27.2%	No change

* A breakfast mandate was passed by the state legislature between 1980-81 and 1981-82.

1 These states compared October 1980 and October 1981.

2 These states compared November 1980 and November 1981.

3 These states compared March 1981 and March 1982.

4 These states compared January 1981 and January 1982.

The following chart groups the states according to the percentage of students who dropped out of the Breakfast Program. (Sixteen percent had increased participation.):

% of Drop in Total Student Participation	Number of States in the Category
0 - 10%	18%
11 - 20%	21%
21 - 30%	34%
31 - 40%	5%
Over 40%	5%

Overall, the 38 reporting states had lost 239,335 students from the Breakfast Program: 40% paid meals, and 60 percent reduced price and free meals. (That means that over three-fifths of the decrease in Breakfast Program participation consists of low income children.) If we compare this drop with USDA's April 1981 total Breakfast Program participation figures, we can see that at least* 6 percent of the Breakfast Program participants have been lost.

Thirty state directors responded to the question about numbers of participating schools that have dropped out of the Breakfast Program. These states reported a loss of 336 schools,* the majority of them public. (According to USDA's April 1981 figures, 35,099 schools participated in the Breakfast Program during the 1980-81 school year.)

---

* This figure is based on the states from whom we have participation figures. (It is also based on January, February, and March averages unless otherwise noted. Therefore, the true percentage drop is higher.)

A Note About Participation Figures

It should be noted that between 1980-1981 and 1981-1982, school enrollment dropped nationwide. Therefore, some of the decrease in school and student participation in the School Breakfast and Lunch programs is probably due to this drop in enrollment. However, the state child nutrition directors surveyed did not list declining enrollment as a major reason for drops in School Lunch and Breakfast Program participation by schools or students. In fact, the impact of enrollment declines on total decreases in School Lunch and Breakfast Program participation appears to be small. Declining enrollment cannot explain the large drops in school and student participation in these programs.

State Efforts to Maintain Participation by Schools and Children

Forty-one state departments of education (out of 44) have made efforts to maintain or increase participation by schools in the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs in the 1981-82 school year.

Their efforts are described in the following table:

Activity	Number of States
Outreach through printed materials inlcuding pamphlets and newsletters (one state mailed materials to all schools; one state published pamphlets comparing the home-packed lunch and the school lunch, in price and nutritive value)	15
Increased on-site visits and technical assistance, including help in analyzing financial planning and program management.	10
Making available information on cost analysis and cost-reducing techniques (e.g., publicizing simplified recordkeeping techniques and "offer v. serve" in elementary	

schools, information on setting up salad bars, etc.) 9

Direct contact with principals, superintendents, teachers (e.g., personal message from state superintendent to all local superintendents in one state) 6

Outreach through workshops 5

Use of media (TV, radio, newspapers)—for example, one state sent articles to all the newspapers in the state 5

Emphasis on positive effects of Breakfast Program on children and on school finances 3

Information sent out on how to increase student participation in program, including how to run marketing campaigns 2

Trained school lunch people in merchandising meals 2

Other activities mentioned by the states were: the state agency acting as a broker to get foods at a cheaper price for local school districts; supporting state legislation for funding meals; a letter sent out to all non-participating schools describing eligibility and benefits and offering technical assistance; encouraging administrators to re-evaluate unnecessary price increases; training teachers in nutrition and involving them in the Program; letters addressed to students in the state; letters to Title I coordinators and state PTA presidents; and "making it difficult for schools to get out of the program."

Thirty-five of the state departments of education have made efforts to maintain or increase participation by children in the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs in the 1981-1982 school year. Their efforts are described in the following table:

Thirty-five of the state departments of education have made efforts to maintain or increase participation by children in the National School Lunch

and Breakfast Programs in the 1981-1982 school year. Their efforts are described in the following table:

Activity	Number of States
Information and technical assistance provided on how to increase student participation (e.g., in one state five specialists each visited four schools per week to help in increasing participation, and two states encouraged provision of choice within the meal as a method for increaseing participation)	19
Use of media (TV, radio, newspapers)	9
Printed materials (including two states with brochures on "Do you really know what ahome-packed lunch costs?")	6
Workshops and meetings	6
Youth advisory councils encouraged, along with general involvement of parents and students in menu planning, menu preference surveys, and using the parent-student "councils" as a forum to increase understanding of value of the Program	6
Cost-reducing information (including encouraging a la carte and offer v. serve)	4
Education of legislators	2
Marketing campaigns (e.g., National School Lunch Week)	2
Encouraged administrators to re-evaluate unnecessary price increases	2
Reached children through nutrition education efforts (e.g., with the Nutrition Education and Training Program)	2

Other activities mentioned by the state directors were: encouraging participation by schools in the Breakfast Program to make total school meals operation more financially viable; training teachers in nutrition and involving them in the Program; writing letters to all the students in the state; one-to-one discussions with school food service supervisors; and getting school personnel to eat with students.

Price of Paid Lunches

When asked the average price of paid meals in their states in school year 1980-1981 and in 1981-1982, 42 directors responded. (The average price decreased in only two states, Arkansas and New Jersey.)

Average Price of Paid Lunch in 1981-82

State	Average Price (in cents)*
Alabama	92
Arizona	100
Arkansas	55
California	100
Colorado	90
Connecticut	85-100
Delaware	80
Florida	78-110
Georgia	65
Hawaii	45
Idaho	69-80
Indiana	75-80
Iowa	76.94
Kentucky	70-85
Louisiana	59
Maine	75-80

*If two prices are listed, the first is the average elementary school price, and the second is the average secondary school price.

Maryland	90
Minnesota	75
Mississippi	85
Missouri	78
Montana	80
Nebraska	82-92
Nevada	75-95
New Hampshire	79
New Jersey	56-67
New Mexico	80
North Dakota	73
Oregon	75-85
Pennsylvania	90
Puerto Rico	115
Rhode Island	80-90
South Carolina	70-75
South Dakota	80-90
Tennessee	85.2
Texas	75-80
Utah	78
Vermont	80
Virginia	65-75
Washington, D.C.	60
Washington	80-95
West Virginia	65
Wyoming	90-100

Based on these 44 states, the average price for a paid lunch in the 1981-82 school years was 79.8¢. Since the average price in 1980-81 was 63.5¢, this means that the price of a paid lunch increased by 16.3¢.

Average Increase in Price

Of Paid Lunch From

1980-81 to 1981-82

Alabama	17
Alaska	15
Arizona	25
California	25
Colorado	10
Connecticut	10
Delaware	15
Florida	23
Georgia	10
Hawaii	20
Idaho	14
Indiana	10
Iowa	17
Kentucky	5
Maine	15
Maryland	25
Minnesota	15
Mississippi	20
Missouri	18
Montana	20
Nebraska	18
Nevada	25
New Hampshire	14
New Mexico	20
North Dakota	15

Oregon	10
Pennsylvania	25
Puerto Rico	40
Rhode Island	10
South Carolina	10
South Dakota	10
Tennessee	13.9
Texas	10
Utah	21
Vermont	30
Virginia	15
Washington, D.C.	No change
Washington	18
West Virginia	15
Wyoming	15

The following chart summarizes the range in the average price increases of a paid lunch:

Increase in Price of Paid Lunch from 1980-81 to 1981-82	Number of States Reporting This Increase
No change	1
$.05	1
$.10	9
$.11-$.15	11
$.16-$.20	9
$.21-$.25	7
$.30	1
$.40	1

State Financial Support for the School Lunch Program

In 17 of the 44 states surveyed, the state provided funds to support the School Lunch Program in 1980-1981, beyond what is required by the National School Lunch Act. This dropped to 13 in 1981-1982. The kinds of support states provided in both school years are listed below:

State	1980-1981	1981-1982
Alaska	Replaced 1/3 of federal loss that year	State dropped support
California	8.18¢/lunch	8.67¢/free or reduced price lunch
Delaware	Salaries of local supervisors and 25% of other staff salaries ($1.6 million)	Same as 1980-81
Georgia	10¢/lunch	Same as 1980-81
Hawaii	State supports, but no response given to this question	
Louisiana	9¢/lunch	State dropped support
Maryland	16¢/free or reduced price lunch	Same as 1980-81
Michigan	5¢/free lunch; 2¢/reduced price lunch	State dropped support
Minnesota	5.3¢/paid lunch	5.5¢/paid lunch
Nevada	3¢/lunch ($360,000)	Same as 1980-81
New Jersey	8.4¢/free or reduced price meal; 6¢ for all meals	8.4¢/free or reduced price meal; 6¢ for all private school meals; 3.3¢ for all public school meals
Pennsylvania	3¢/breakfast	State dropped support
Rhode Island	Subsidized by state to make up difference between federal funds and children's payments	Same as 1980-81
South Carolina	Financial help for paying food service personnel	Same as 1980-1981
Utah	12.8¢/lunch	Percentage of liquor tax goes to the School Lunch Program
Washington	State provides support but no response given to this question	
West Virginia	Partial payment of labor	Same as 1980-81

Washington	State provides support but no response given to this question	
West Virginia	Partial payment of labor	Same as 1980-81

Summary

Last year's budget cuts and statutory changes in the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs have been felt nationwide. Schools have dropped out of the School Lunch Program since last year, but, percentage-wise, there has been much more student drop-out than school drop-out. Most of the schools that have dropped the Lunch Program are small elementary schools in rural or suburban areas with a majority of non-poor students. The major reasons for school drop-out have been the decrease in federal reimbursement and drop-out by private schools with tuitions over $1,500 a year.

Sixty-two percent of the states responding had drops in student participation in the National School Lunch Program of over 10%, and of those students dropping out, over one-third were low income. The major reasons students dropped out were the increased price of lunch, the change in income guidelines, adverse publicity about the Lunch Program, and the new application procedures. It seems clear that the decrease in student participation in the Lunch Program can only be partially explained by drop-out of schools. Many of the students are dropping out of on-going lunch programs.

As with the Lunch Program, more children than schools, percentage-wise, have dropped out of the Breakfast Program. However, in some states there have been large drop-outs by schools. The major reasons schools have dropped out have been decreasing participation, increasing costs, decreased reimbursements, and school board opposition to the Program. Most of the schools that have dropped out have been small, rural or suburban elementary schools. Different

from the Lunch Program drop-outs, however, the Breakfast Program drop-outs include proportionate amounts of poor and non-poor schools, many of them Title I schools.

Sixty-five percent of the states reported drops in student School Breakfast participation over 10%, and of those students dropping out, three-fifths were low income. The major reasons for student drop-out were the increased price and changes in income eligibility guidelines.

The average increase in the cost of a paid school lunch was 16.3¢, but almost half of the states responding had average increases above this amount.

States have attempted many creative ways to maintain School Lunch and Breakfast participation by students and schools. However, only 13 of the 44

B. Selected Schools

Background Information

The results of our selected school survey are based on information from twelve states. We collected data from 19 schools (in 11 states) that have maintained the School Lunch Program (8 elementary and 11 secondary) and 8 schools (in 4 states) that have dropped the School Lunch Program (4 elementary and 4 secondary).

The table below shows their geographic distribution:

States In Which Selected Schools Are Located

Schools That Have Maintained Lunch Program

State	Number of Schools
Alabama	2
California	2
Florida	1
Illinois	2
Kentucky	2
Minnesota	2
Missouri	2
New Jersey	1
Oregon	2
Utah	2
Vermont	1

Schools That Have Dropped Lunch Program

State	Number of Schools
Minnesota	2
Oregon	2
Pennsylvania	2
Vermont	2
	8

The following table shows the kinds of schools surveyed:

Kinds of Schools Surveyed

Characteristics of School	Location			Size			Income*		
	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Large	Medium	Small	1	2	3
Elementary Schools with Program (8)	2	2	4	0	3	5	4	2	2
Secondary Schools with Program (11)	4	3	4	1	6	4	3	5	3
Sub-total	6	5	8	1	9	9	7	7	5
Elementary Schools without Program (4)	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	4	0
Secondary Schools without Program (4)	2	2	0	1	2	1	1	2	1
Sub-total	3	5	0	1	3	4	1	6	1
Total	9	10	8	2	12	13	8	13	6

*1 = Majority Low Income students

2 = About half low income students and half non-poor students

3 = Majority non-poor students

The numbers of each kind of person surveyed are shown in the following table:

Kinds of People Surveyed

Characteristics of School	Present (or former) School Food Director	Students (4th or 10th Grade)	Principal	Teacher	Nurse
Elementary Schools with Program	10	180	Not applicable		
Secondary Schools with Program	10	183	Not applicable		
Sub-total	20	363	Not applicable		
Elementary Schools without Program	1	89	3	2	2
Secondary Schools without Program	2	98	3	4	2
Sub-total	3	187	6	6	4
Total	23	550	6	6	4

Elementary Schools that Have Maintained the Lunch Program

Background Information

The majority of elementary schools that had maintained the Program have on-site preparation of meals. They have raised their prices from 1980-81 to 1981-82, on the average, by 13¢, but the range of increase was between 0 and 25¢. (Only one school had not raised its price for paid meals.)

How Elementary Schools Maintained Program

When asked how they have maintained the National School Lunch Program, despite cutbacks in federal funding, the most frequent answers were: increased cost of lunches for paying students, decreased the number of employees, changes in menu-planning, "merchandising" the Lunch Program to students, and increased use of commodities.

The chart below shows the extent to which various methods were used to maintain the Lunch Program. (Every school had made some changes to cope with cutbacks in federal funding.)

Methods Used to Maintain Elementary School Lunch Program

Method	Number Responding
Increased cost of lunches to paying students	8
Decreased number of employees	8
Changes in menu-planning	7
Increased use of commodities	6
Merchandising the Lunch Program to students	6
Changed management practices	3
Changed equipment use	3
Increased use of cheaper items	3
Changes in buying procedures	3
Changed to a different food preparation and delivery system	3
Changed training practices	2
Decreased volume of food prepared	2
Addition of a la carte line or increase in a la carte items	2
Use of volunteer labor	2
Omission of desserts	2
Different banking procedures	2

Changes in storage methods	1
Offer choices of food	1
Cut employee hours	1

What schools have not done to maintain the Lunch Program is almost as interesting as what they have done. Not one elementary school had increased the volume of lunches, added a vending machine, or added a snack bar.

When asked to describe in detail the three changes that were most crucial in allowing them to maintain the Lunch Program, the two that came up most often were decreasing staffing and increasing price. Other responses that came up more than once were: increasing the use of commodities, using offer versus serve, "merchandising" the lunch, making changes in the preparation and delivery system (one school changed from on-site meal preparation to prepackaged meals, while another went from prepackaged lunches to bulk food preparation and delivery), and making changes in the menu (one school decreased portion sizes and another offered choices for the first time). Other crucial changes mentioned were decreasing staff hours and better use of bidding procedures.

Outside Sources of Help to Maintain Elementary School Lunch Program

The majority of the schools did not request assistance from the district, state, or USDA regional office in adjusting to the budget cuts in the school lunch Program. A majority do receive state or local financing for the Lunch Program, beyond the federal reimbursement, and this funding has tended to remain the same.

In seven of the eleven elementary schools surveyed, a large number of children had dropped out of the Lunch Program since 1980-81. The three most common sources of lunch for these children who dropped out are: bringing their lunch from home, not eating lunch at all, and buying lunch from a la carte lines or snack bars at school.

When asked how they felt about the future of the Lunch Program in their schools, five school food service directors said it depended on the continuation of federal funds, one said it depended on the amount of commodities available, three said the outlook was bleak because the prices were high and children could not afford them, and two said they had a positive outlook on the future.

Students in Elementary Schools That Have Maintained the Programs

Sixty-seven percent of the 180 students surveyed eat breakfast often, and twenty-seven percent eat it sometimes. Eighty-two percent often eat lunch and 17 percent sometimes do. Only 6 percent never eat breakfast and 1 percent never eat lunch.

On the day they were surveyed, 92 percent ate lunch, and 92 percent of those ate it at school. Seventy-six percent of the lunch eaters ate a school lunch and 20 percent ate a lunch from home. The others bought food from snack machine or a store, or got it from a friend.

Fifty-three percent of those who ate lunch drank milk, 8 percent drank fruit or vegetable juice, and 6 percent drank soda pop, fruit punch, Kool-ade or orangeade. The following items were eaten for lunch by the children surveyed:

Food Item	% of Children Eating that Item
Bread or roll	60
Noodles or spaghetti	25
Chicken or fish	27
Sandwich	34
Potato chips, corn chips, pretzels, or french fries	17
Hot dog or hamburger	22

Vegetable	43
Cake, donut, or cookie	25
Pizza	2
Fruit	60
Soup	3
Ice Cream	4
Candy	5
Cheese	22
Burritos, tacos or enchiladas	13

Thirty percent often got hungry in the afternoon, and fifty-six percent got hungry sometimes in the afternoon. Fifty-eight percent never got sleepy or tired in the afternoon and thirty-three percent sometimes got sleepy or tired. Sixty-nine percent never fell asleep in class, and 27 percent sometimes did. Thirty-nine percent never had trouble paying attention in the afternoon, and forty-nine percent sometimes had trouble, but only 10 percent often had trouble paying attention in the afternoon.

Secondary Schools that Have Maintained the Lunch Program

Background Information

The majority of secondary schools that had maintained the program have on-site preparation of meals. They had raised their prices from 1980-81 to 1981-82, on the average, by 16.5¢, but the range was between 0 and 50¢. (Only one school had not raised the price of paid meals.)

How Secondary Schools Maintain the Program

When asked how they have maintained the National School Lunch Program, despite cutbacks in federal funding, the most frequent answers were: increased cost of lunches for paying students, increased use of commodities, decreased number of employees, and "merchandising" the Lunch Program to students, just as they were for the elementary schools that had maintained the program.

The chart below shows the methods most used and least used to maintain the Lunch Program. (Every school had made some changes to cope with cutbacks in federal funding.)

Methods Used to Maintain
Secondary School Lunch Program

Method	Number Responding
Increased cost of lunches for paying students	9
Increased use of commodities	8
Decreased number of employees	7
"Merchandising" the Lunch Program	6
Decreased volume of lunches prepared	4
Changes in menu-planning	3
Changed management practices	2
Changed training practices	2
Increased use of cheaper items	2
Addition of a la carte line or increase in a la carte items	2
Omission of desserts	2
Increased volume of lunches prepared	1
Addition of snack bar	1
Changes in buying procedures	1
Changes in storage methods	1
Different banking procedures	1
Offer versus serve	1

None of the schools: changed equipment use, added vending machines, used volunteer labor, or changed to a different food preparation and delivery system.

When asked to describe the three changes that were most crucial in allowing them to maintain the Lunch Program, the three that came up most often were decreasing the number of employees and their hours, increasing price, and changing the menu. (One school now serves two choices of main dish, one school serves only those foods required by federal regulations, and one has increased the number of times hamburgers and salads are served.) Other crucial changes mentioned were implementation of offer versus serve, increased use of commodities, addition of an a la carte line and "merchandising" of the Program.

Outside Sources of Help to Maintain Secondary School Lunch Program

The majority of the schools did not request assistance from the district, state, or USDA regional office in adjusting to the budget cuts in the School Lunch Program. A majority do receive state or local financing for the Lunch Program, beyond the federal reimbursement, but this funding has tended to decrease.

In seven of the ten schools, a large number of children have dropped out of the Lunch Program since 1980-81. The four most common sources of lunch for these children are: not eating lunch at all, bringing lunch from home, buying lunch from a la carte lines or snack bars at school, and buying lunch at a fast food restaurant.

When asked how they felt about the future of the Lunch Program in their schools, five school food service directors said that the federal budget cuts have hurt the program and more cuts would further jeopardize the program. One expressed the feeling that if commodities continued to be available they would survive. Three expressed optimism about the future of the Program.

Students in Secondary Schools

That Have Maintained the Programs

Forty percent of the 183 students surveyed eat breakfast often, and forty-four percent eat it sometimes. Fifty-four percent often eat lunch, and thirty-five percent sometimes do. Only sixteen percent never eat breakfast, and fourteen percent never eat lunch.

On the day they were surveyed, seventy-nine percent ate lunch: seventy-eight percent of those ate it at school while ten percent ate it at home. Eleven percent of the lunch-eaters brought their lunch from home, and 26 percent bought foods from the a la carte line, a snack machine, a student bake sale or student store, or the school canteen or snack bar. Thirteen percent obtained food from outside--a fast food or other restaurant, a truck selling food outside the school, or a store. (Some students obtained lunch from more than one source.) Of those children who did not eat a school lunch, sixty-three percent spent 75¢ or less, while thirty-seven percent spent more than $1.00.

Forty-six percent of those who ate lunch drank milk, ten percent drank fruit or vegetable juice, nine percent drank a milkshake, and thirty-two percent had fruit punch, kool-ade, orange-ade or soda pop. The following items were eaten for lunch by the children surveyed:

Food Item	% of Children Eating that Item
Bread or roll	20
Noodles or spaghetti	2
Chicken or fish	16
Sandwich	30
Potato chips, corn chips, pretzels, or french fries	35
Hot dog or hamburger	26
Vegetable	19
Cake, donut, or cookie	21

Pizza	3
Fruit	24
Soup	4
Ice Cream	9
Candy	5
Cheese	8
Burritos, tacos or enchiladas	1

Twenty-eight percent often got hungry during the afternoon, and fifty-nine percent sometimes got hungry. Twenty-four percent often felt sleepy or tired in the afternoon and fifty-nine percent sometimes did. Fifty-six percent never fell asleep in class in the afternoon, while thirty-three percent sometimes fell asleep in class. Thirty-three percent never had trouble paying attention in the afternoon, while forty-nine percent sometimes had trouble. Only sixteen percent often had trouble paying attention in the afternoon.

Elementary Schools that Have Dropped The School Lunch Program

Former School Food Service Director

A former elementary school food service director was interviewed. When the school operated the National School Lunch Program, this director had liked the commodities and the nutrition education which came with the Lunch Program, but had not liked the cost of running the program, "too many regulations," and problems with free and reduced price meals. The school dropped out of the Program in the summer of 1981.

During 1980-81 the school's average participation was over 500, which included over 40 percent free and reduced price meals. The charge for paid meals was 60¢. Now, the two major sources of lunch at the school are a school-run, self-supporting lunch program (consisting of the same pattern as the National School Lunch Program except amounts can be smaller, and either one

fruit or one vegetable may be served)* and bag lunches. The cost of the lunch to all students has gone up to 75¢.

There are no free and reduced price lunches anymore for low income children were getting an adequate lunch and none were going without lunch. (However, one hundred-fifty fewer students are participating in the new school lunch program.)

According to the former director, a public announcement was made regarding the possible dropping of the Lunch Program, and the total school district was involved in the decision to drop the program. Arguments made in favor of keeping the program included children's need for food in order to be able to learn, while the main argument against the Program was its cost. (There had been a decrease in local funding between the 1980-81 and 1981-82 school years.) The school superintendent obtained information from USDA and the state, "did a study of the program," and recommended to the school board that the Program should be dropped. According to the former director, financial help would be necessary for the National School Lunch Program to be started again in the school.

---

*The reason for including this school and its secondary school counterpart in the category of "schools that have dropped the National School Lunch Program" is obvious--they did drop the national Program, and replaced it with one that is nutritionally inferior and less available to low income children. However, we were concerned about the effect of its inclusion on the student data from schools that have dropped the School Lunch Program and have not replaced it with a locally-run lunch program. Therefore, we analyzed that effect, and found that in it made little or no difference.

Elementary School Students

Eighty-nine children in three elementary schools that dropped were surveyed. Seventy-four percent of these students ate breakfast often, and 20 percent sometimes ate it. Eighty-six percent often ate lunch, and 12 percent sometimes ate it. Ninety-nine percent ate lunch the day they were surveyed. Fifty-eight percent of them brought their lunch from home. The rest ate a non-federally subsidized school lunch, but none bought it from a snack machine or store.

Seventy percent drank milk for lunch and 15 percent drank soda pop, fruit punch, Kool-ade, or orange-ade. The foods eaten by the children are listed below:

Food Item	% of Children Eating that Item
Bread or roll	48
Noodles or spaghetti	3
Chicken or fish	40
Sandwich	46
Potato chips, corn chips, pretzels, or french fries	33
Hot dog or hamburger	7
Vegetable	44
Cake, donut, or cookie	26
Pizza	1
Fruit	34
Soup	3
Ice cream	6
Candy	6
Cheese	2
Burritos, tacos or enchiladas	0

Forty-four percent often got hungry during the afternoon, but forty-four percent never got hungry then. Sixty percent never felt sleepy or tired in the afternoon and eighty-five percent never fell asleep in class during the afternoon. Forty-six percent never had trouble paying attention in the afternoon, while nineteen percent often did.

Elementary School Teachers

Two elementary school teachers from schools that dropped the Program were interviewed. One noticed a difference in the students between this year and last year that seemed to be related to the loss of the Lunch Program, but the other did not notice a difference. The one who noticed the difference added that some students bring "skimpy" lunches, or none at all. Both felt attentiveness and attendance were the same compared to last year. However, one felt that behavior problems had increased, while the other thought they were about the same. One felt classroom performance was about the same; the other thought it had improved. One felt complaints of headaches, nausea, and stomachaches had been reduced; the other felt that they were about the same. One estimated that one child in her class goes without lunch; the other said none did. One felt 51-75% of her class got an adequate lunch; the other, 76-100%. When asked if they wanted to add anything at the end of the questionnaire, one stated that the school-supported lunch program was excellent, while the other felt that the nutritional value of lunches brought to school was poor.

Secondary Schools that Dropped

The School Lunch Program

Two former secondary school food service directors were interviewed. When their schools were operating the Program, they liked the nutritional quality of the meals and the fact that nutrition education could be reinforced.

On the other hand, they did not like the high labor costs and the regulations. Both schools dropped out during summer 1981. One served over 900 students a day, 91 percent of them paying students. The other had served almost 300 students a day, sixty-two percent paying students.

Both replaced their lunch programs with a la carte lines. The vast majority of students depend on this replacement as a source of lunch, according to the directors. The rest bring lunch from home or do not eat lunch. The foods offered on the a la carte lines include salads, hamburgers, hot dogs, sandwiches, ice cream, pizza, and egg rolls. The average cost of the replacement is $1.00 in one school and $1.50 in the other. The charge for a school lunch the year before was 65-75¢ and 80¢, respectively.

According to the directors, both schools dropped the Program because they could not afford it any longer. A public announcement was made regarding the possible dropping of the Lunch Program, and in one district parents were consulted in making the decision. Arguments made in favor of keeping the program were student's nutritional needs and nutrition education. The argument against the program was its cost. (There was a decrease in state or local funding for the Lunch Program in both schools between 1980-81 and 1981-82. [One school requested help and information from outside sources (i.e., State Department of Education or USDA Regional Office) and one did not.]

When asked what would have to change for the Lunch Program to be started again in their schools, one director said a higher federal reimbursement and the other said that the students were happy with a la carte and did not want the School Lunch Program.

Secondary School Students

Ninety-eight tenth grade students were surveyed. Forty-six percent often eat breakfast in the morning, but 19 percent never eat it. Fifty-four percent often eat lunch, but 8 percent never do. On the day they were surveyed, 82

percent ate lunch, and 18 percent did not. Of those who ate lunch, only 5 percent ate at home, and 29 percent ate a lunch brought from home. Thirty-seven percent ate a school lunch. (One school had replaced the federal program with a locally supported program.) Fifteen percent bought lunches a la carte and 7 percent bought their lunches from snack machines, school snack bars, bake sales, or student stores. Sixteen percent bought their lunches from fast food restaurants or stores. (Some students purchased lunches from several sources.) For those students who did not eat a school lunch, 42 percent ate lunch for 75¢ or less, and 58 percent paid more than 76¢ per lunch. (Twenty-seven per cent paid more than $1.50.)

Of those who ate lunch, 50 percent drank milk, 4 percent drank fruit or vegetable juice, and 24 percent drank soda pop, fruit punch, kool-ade, or orange-ade. The foods eaten are listed below:

Food Item	% Eating that Item
Bread or roll	6
Noodles or spaghetti	0
Chicken or fish	1
Sandwich	44
Potato chips, corn chips, pretzels, or french fries	45
Hot dog or hamburger	34
Vegetable	11
Cake, donut, or cookie	24
Pizza	5
Fruit	14
Soup	0
Ice cream	12

Ice cream	12
Candy	9
Cheese	2
Burritos, tacos or enchiladas	2

Twenty-five percent of the students surveyed often got hungry during the afternoon, and 62 percent sometimes got hungry at that time. Twenty-three percent often felt sleepy or tired in the afternoon and 69 percent sometimes felt sleepy or tired in the afternoon. Sixty percent never fell asleep in class in the afternoon, although 32 percent sometimes did. Twenty-four percent never had trouble paying attention in the afternoon, while sixty-three percent sometimes did.

Secondary School Teachers

Four secondary school teachers were interviewed. None of them noticed any differences in their students between this year and last year that seemed to be related to the loss of the National School Lunch Program. However, all four felt that attentiveness had gotten worse since last year. One thought attendance was worse, while the others thought it was about the same. One thought that complaints of headaches, nausea or stomachaches this year compared to last had increased, while the rest thought that they were about the same. One felt that behavior problems were reduced and classroom performance improved, while the rest thought both were about the same.

Two of the teachers felt that one child in their classes went without lunch, one thought two students did, and one thought that none did. Two teachers said they did not know what percentage of their students got an adequate lunch. One said 0 to 25 percent did, and the other 51 to 75 percent. When asked if they had anything else that they would like to add, one said that she worried about the students because they had to walk quite a distance to get lunch outside the school at a store or fast food restaurant.

Elementary and Secondary School Nurses

Four nurses were interviewed -- two from elementary schools and two from secondary schools. When asked if they noticed any difference in the students between 1980-81 and 1981-82 that seemed to be related to the loss of the Lunch Program, two said yes and two said no. One nurse noticed increased physical and emotional problems; the other, problems related to fewer balanced meals. Three nurses felt that complaints of headaches, nausea and stomachaches were about the same; one nurse said they had increased. One nurse felt that one child in her school went without lunch; one said two; one said two to three; and one said none. One nurse felt that 26 to 50 percent of the children got adequate lunches. One said 51 to 75 percent; and two said 76 to 100 percent ate adequately at lunchtime.

Elementary and Secondary School Principals

Six principals were interviewed -- three from elementary schools and three from secondary schools. When the School Lunch Program was operated in their schools, they liked the "balanced, hot meal," the quality and quantity of food served, and felt that the donated commodities were helpful. When asked what they did not like about the program, the most frequent response was that operation costs were too high, although concerns about paperwork, record-keeping, "waste," regulations, and "abuse of free and reduced price meals" were also mentioned.

According to the principals, the three most common sources of lunch for their students are bringing lunch from home, buying lunch from a la carte lines or school snack bars (only in the secondary schools), or not eating lunch. One secondary school principal added that a major source of lunch for his students was a fast food restaurant.

One principal thought that no students in his school went without lunch; one thought one went without; two thought two students did not eat lunch; and one thought three to five went without lunch. Two principals thought that 26 to 50 percent of their students ate an adequate lunch; one thought that 51 to 75 percent did; and three felt that 76 to 100 percent of their students ate adequately at lunchtime.

According to the principals, public announcements were made regarding the possible dropping of the Lunch Program from their schools. In one school the principal, school board and cooks were consulted in making the decision to drop the program, in one district a town meeting was held and the issue was voted on, in one district the issue was on the town ballot, and in one district parents were consulted before the program was dropped. Arguments made in favor of keeping the Lunch Program were that the programs provided good meals; that "students might turn to junk food"; that students "needed" the Lunch Program; and that low income children in particular depended on the Program for "proper nutrition." However, the program was dropped in all of these schools because school districts felt that they would have to subsidize the Lunch Program as a result of the decrease in federal funds, and could not afford to do that.

When asked what would have to change for the National School Lunch Program to be started again in their schools, two said a higher federal reimbursement; one said more commodities;* two said more "local control";* and one said a "simplified program" that required only soup and salad.*

---

*Interestingly enough, more commodities are being made available this year. Also, local control is already high in the Lunch Program, and adding a cup of milk and a piece of bread to soup and salad would meet the Lunch Program meal pattern requirements. (And, if pasta was added to the soup, the bread would not have to be added.)

Finally, when asked if there was anything they wanted to add, we got two very different, but interesting responses, both from elementary school principals. From the school that had replaced the federal program with their own, the principal said that they had proved that a locally controlled program is feasible "without government interference" and that he felt that "poor families can provide for their kids without government help." (This school no longer provides free and reduced price lunches for low income children, and one-third of their students no longer participate in the School Lunch Program.) The other principal who responded to this open-ended question said he was sorry to see the program end because the lunches brought from home were not as nutritious as the school lunches.

Does Eating A School Lunch Make A Difference?

In the following table, children who eat school lunches are compared with those who do not, in schools where the Lunch Program has been maintained. It is clear from this table that more children who eat a school lunch drink milk and eat a fruit and a vegetable than those who do not. Since these three foods are major sources of essential nutrients, the school lunch eaters are probably getting more of their nutritional needs fulfilled by eating lunch than the non-school lunch eaters.

	Elementary Schools with National School Lunch Program				Secondary Schools with National School Lunch Program			
	Children Eating School Lunch		Children Not Eating School Lunch		Children Eating School Lunch		Children Not Eating School Lunch	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Drinks								
Milk	91%	(120)	50%	(25)	71%	(56)	18%	(19)
Soda Pop	3%	(4)	10%	(5)	2%	(2)	21%	(22)

	Elementary Schools with National School Lunch Program				Secondary Schools with National School Lunch Program			
	Children Eating School Lunch		Children Not Eating School Lunch		Children Eating School Lunch		Children Not Eating School Lunch	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Fruit or Vegetable juice	5%	(7)	8%	(4)	10%	(8)	8%	(8)
Milkshake	0%	(0)	2%	(1)	14%	(11)	12%	(13)
Fruit punch, Orange-ade or Kool-ade	0%	(0)	2%	(1)	3%	(10)	5%	(5)
Food Items								
Bread or roll	70%	(92)	20%	(10)	29%	(23)	28%	(29)
Noodles or Spaghetti	31%	(41)	2%	(1)	2%	(2)	7%	(7)
Chicken or fish	31%	(41)	12%	(6)	26%	(21)	1%	(1)
Sandwich	21%	(28)	64%	(32)	32%	(25)	4%	(4)
Potato chips, corn chips, pretzels or french fries	14%	(18)	34%	(17)	32%	(25)	23%	(24)
Hot dogs or hamburgers	25%	(33)	10%	(5)	37%	(29)	28%	(29)
Vegetable	75%	(99)	14%	(7)	39%	(31)	11%	(12)
Cake, doughnut or cookie	21%	(28)	30%	(15)	13%	(10)	3%	(3)
Pizza	1%	(2)	4%	(2)	6%	(5)	21%	(22)

	Elementary Schools with National School Lunch Program				Secondary Schools with National School Lunch Program			
	Children Eating School Lunch		Children Not Eating School Lunch		Children Eating School Lunch		Children Not Eating School Lunch	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Fruit	65%	(86)	28%	(14)	40%	(32)	2%	(2)
Soup	1%	(2)	10%	(5)	4%	(3)	4%	(4)
Ice cream	5%	(7)	10%	(5)	5%	(4)	8%	(8)
Candy	2%	(3)	12%	(6)	1%	(1)	9%	(9)
Cheese	23%	(31)	16%	(8)	10%	(8)	2%	(2)
Burritos, tacos, or enchiladas	17%	(22)	2%	(1)	1%	(1)	6%	(6)

Does Having A School Lunch Program Make A Difference?

If one looks at the whether students eat lunch at all, on a regular basis or on the day they were surveyed, having or not having a school lunch program does not appear to make a difference in the schools which were studied.

However, if one looks at what school lunch eaters consume versus children who attend schools without the National School Lunch Program, one notes that more school lunch eaters tend to consume milk, a fruit, and a vegetable than students in schools without the National School Lunch Program. (This can be seen by comparing the first and third columns of the chart on pages 80-82 with the information on pages 73, 76, and 77.) The same nutritional differences mentioned in the previous comparison (between children eating school lunch and those not eating it in a school that has a school lunch program) hold true for this comparison as well.

The answers to the questions on whether children feel hungry, sleepy or tired, fall asleep in class or have trouble paying attention in the afternoon showed little difference between children participating and not participating in the school lunch program within a school that still operated the program. There was also little difference in response between children participating in the School Lunch Program and the children from schools that had dropped the School Lunch Program.

Summary

Not as many responses came back from the selected schools as we had hoped for. We were depending on "anti-hunger advocate" interviewers who faced deep financial cuts, decreases in staff, and increases in workload this spring, so some found that they did not have the time to do the survey in their communities. Some advocates reported to us that since they were located in poorer areas, it was more difficult to locate schools that had dropped out of the Lunch Program than they had thought. Finally, advocates reported to us that when schools that dropped out were located, the schools were often hostile to any questions regarding their decision to close the program or to any questionnaires about the impact of the drop-out on children.

In spite of these problems, the responses we did get are interesting, and still give us some indications about what is happening in schools nationwide. They also point out some areas that other studies might want to pursue.

There were large drops in participation in the elementary and secondary schools with lunch programs that we surveyed. But despite the budget cuts in the School Lunch Program and the decreases in volume of lunches sold, these schools were able to maintain their lunch programs. Each school changed one or more things in its operation of the Program in order to adapt to the cuts, but, unfortunately for the children and the employees, the most frequent

changes were an increase in the price of the school lunch and a decrease in the number of employees or in the number of hours they worked. Three other changes that were mentioned, though less frequently, were: better use of commodities, "merchandising" the Lunch Program, and changes in menu planning. The latter two changes were geared toward increasing student participation in spite of the increased price of the lunch.

The majority of these schools depended on state or local financing. Obviously they would suffer a great deal if that non-federal assistance was lost. (Interestingly enough, the school food service directors we surveyed tended not to ask for outside technical assistance in adjusting to the cuts.)

Children who have dropped out of the Lunch Program in these schools brought their lunch, did not eat a lunch, or bought foods from an a la carte line. In the secondary schools, non-participants also used fast food restaurants as a source of lunch.

In the schools that had dropped the Lunch Program, the major alternatives used were not eating lunch, bringing it from home, or eating from the a la carte line. When children bought their lunch, it cost more than 76¢ (close to the national average for paid meals) for fifty-eight percent of the secondary students. (When one considers that it was probably nutritionally inferior to a school lunch, more than 76¢ seems expensive.)

The argument that was made most often in favor of dropping the Program was the decreased federal reimbursement, leading to higher costs which the school officials or board did not want to support. However, arguments made in favor of keeping the Program consistently discussed the need for a balanced meal, concern about nutrition education, and concern over what would happen to the low income children in the community if there were not a Lunch Program.

Interestingly enough, two arguments that were never made against the Lunch program was poor. Another interesting observation was that teachers, nurses, and principals appear to underestimate the number of secondary school students who do not eat lunch. (Secondary school students were much less likely to eat lunch than elementary school students, in schools with or without a school lunch program.)

Eating a school lunch did make a difference in the kinds of foods eaten. Many more school lunch participants drank milk and ate a fruit and/or a vegetable than non-school lunch participants or than students who were in a school that had dropped the School Lunch Program. However, the questions regarding behavior in the afternoon did not show any differences between school lunch participants and non-participants. Also, approximately the same percentage children in schools with the school lunch program reported having some kind of lunch as in schools without the School Lunch Program. Nevertheless, the nutritional quality of that lunch appears to be quite different.

VI. What Can We Conclude? What Can Be Done?

Impact of Cuts

The fiscal year 1982 budget cuts and legislative changes in the National School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program have had a severe impact on schools and school children nationwide. The impact has been worse, percentage-wise, on the number of children who are no longer participating in these two programs than on the number of schools no longer operating these programs. The percentage of low income children no longer participating compared to middle income non-participants is also high. The number of Breakfast Programs that have been lost is surprising, considering that most children who participate are not paying children, and, therefore, this program should not have felt the budget crunch to the same extent that the School Lunch Program did.

Schools that remain in the Lunch Program appear to be responding to cuts, in large part by increasing the price of paid lunches and decreasing the staff. They do not appear to be asking for outside help in solving their school lunch programs' financial problems. However, they do depend on state or local financial assistance to operate their lunch programs. Unfortunately, the number of states providing financial assistance for the Lunch Program appears to be decreasing, and many of the schools we surveyed were getting less non-federal outside financial assistance than they had last year.

As local and state financing continues to drop nationwide, as it seems to be doing, we can probably expect more children and schools to leave the National School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program. Schools and communities will decide that they no longer can afford the Programs; families facing tighter budgets will decide they cannot afford to pay for the lunches. Obviously any further federal cuts will be devastating.

Our brief look at the nutrition literature related to the school food programs showed us that low income children depend on the School Lunch Program for one-third to one-half of their nutrient intake each day. It is disturbing to see that over one-third of the children who no longer eat a school lunch are low income, and three-fifths of those who no longer eat a school breakfast are low income. Non-participation in these programs, combined with cuts in the Food Stamp Program and other programs that help poor families to survive financially, can only have a negative impact on children's nutritional status. We saw from the literature review that nutritional problems still exist among U.S. school children even with the School Lunch Program in Place. We have some indication of what lunches without the program are like from the schools we surveyed--less children report eating a fruit or a vegetable, and less report drinking milk. This is not surprising, considering the contents of the alternative "lunches" discussed in the review of the literature.

The Need For Financial and Technical Assistance

The need is clear. Beyond the need for financial assistance and, in particular, the maintenance of existing subsidies for school meals, there is also a need for technical assistance of two kinds. Among the schools in our survey who dropped the Lunch Program, the only argument made in favor of dropping the Program was cost. Therefore, one kind of necessary assistance is giving local school districts ideas and help in cutting costs (through the methods some of them mention--better meal-planning, merchandising the program, and improved commodity use, as well as others) and increasing student participation.

The other kind of assistance needed is better arguments to make in favor of maintaning the programs, and better ways to make those arguments. In the schools that dropped out, the arguments for maintaining the Program were good ones: the special nutritional needs of low income children; a concern about what the students would be eating instad of school lunch, etc.; but those

arguments did not carry the day. A combination of cost-saving and participation-increasing ideas, along with improved methods of making the case for School Lunch and Breakfast Programs, would help many communities decide to continue serving lunch and breakfast to schoolchildren.

Both of these kinds of assistance would be helped along by positive leadership on the part of local, state, and federal officials, and the creation of a supportive atmosphere nationally for child nutrition programs. The local and national media, for example, could be helpful in making the case for how important school meals programs are to U.S. schoolchildren. If we want public officials to play a leadership role, and if we want the media to help create a supportive atmosphere for school meals, we will have to make the case to them as well.

Follow-up Studies

As for future research in this area, two follow-up surveys would be useful. The first would be a follow-up survey of the states, done at the same time this school year as it was last year, to get a nationwide picture of changes in participation by schools and children, to find out whether school lunch prices increase again nationwide, and to ascertain the extent to which states continue their financial support of school meals.

Another selected school survey would also be helpful. Along with a special effort to get more teacher and nurse responses, more detailed food and nutrient intake data could be obtained from the students. This would require the training of interviewers in how to find out from children what foods and what amounts they have eaten for lunch (i.e., a dietary recall). It would also require a more statistical and less descriptive study, so that the statistical significance of differences in nutrient intake could be calculated.

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL MEALS INCOME ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES
(Effective From July 1, 1982, to June 30, 1983)

Family size	130 pct free meals year	month	week	185 pct reduced price meals year	month	week
1	6,080	507	117	8,660	722	167
2	8,090	674	156	11,510	959	221
3	10,090	841	194	14,360	1,197	276
4	12,090	1,008	233	17,210	1,434	331
5	14,090	1,174	271	20,050	1,671	386
6	16,090	1,341	309	22,900	1,908	440
7	18,100	1,508	348	25,750	2,146	495
8	20,100	1,675	387	28,600	2,383	550
For each additional member add	2,000	167	38	2,850	238	55

Meal Reimbursement Rates July 1, 1982 to June 30, 1983

National School Lunch Program	Less than 60%	More than 60% */	Commodity Assistance	Total Less than 60%	Total More than 60%
Paid Meals	11¢	13¢	11.5¢	22.5¢	24.5c
Reduced Price Meals	75¢	77¢	11.5¢	86.5¢	88.5c
Free Meals	$1.15	$1.17¢	11.5¢	126.5¢	128.5¢

School Breakfast Program	non-severe need	severe need
Paid Meals	8.75¢	8.75¢
Reduced Price Meals	30.00¢	42.25¢
Free Meals	60.00¢	72.25¢

* Schools where more than 60% of their meals are served at free or reduced priced receive 2¢ more per meal since these schools have a significant percentage of low income children.

APPENDIX C

A Step-by Step Guide
to
Carrying Out the Study

Step 1:

Choose in your state:

- one elementary school with the National School Lunch Program
- one secondary school with the National School Lunch Program
- one elementary school that has dropped the National School Lunch Program
- one secondary school that has dropped the National School Lunch Program

---

Step 2:

In the elementary school with the Program and the secondary school with the Program:

1. Get permission from the principal to:
   - interview the school food service director
   - interview a fourth grade class (in the elementary school) and tenth grade homeroom class (in the secondary school)

A letter from us and a description of the study are enclosed to help you talk to the principal.

2. Make an appointment with the school food service director and interview him/her with the School Food Service Director Questionnaire. A letter from us and a description of the study are enclosed to help you talk to the school food service director.

3. Fourth Grade Class: Make an appointment with the teacher of the fourth grade class for you to bring the Student Questionnaire — Y ("Y" stands for Younger) to the class. Have the class fill out the questionnaires as you read the questions to them orally. Then collect the questionnaires.

Tenth Grade Homeroom Class: Follow the same steps as with the fourth grade class (above), except:

- Make the appointment with the homeroom teacher.
- Use the Student Questionnaire -- O ("O" stands for Older).

- You don't need to read the questions orally to the tenth grade students.

A letter from us to the teacher and a description of the study are enclosed to help you talk to the teacher.

4. Fill out the School Description Form for both the elementary school and the secondary school so we know what kinds of schools you have done your questionnaires in.

Step 3:

In the elementary school that has dropped the Program and in the secondary school that has dropped the Program:

1. Get permission from the principal to interview:

   - him/her
   - a fourth grade class (in the elementary school) and a tenth grade homeroom class (in the secondary school)
   - the teacher of the fourth grade class and the tenth grade homeroom teacher
   - the elementary school's nurse and the secondary school's nurse

Also, request from the principal the name and location of the former food service director for the National School Lunch Program. A letter from us and a description of the study are enclosed to help you talk to the principal.

2. Fourth Grade Class: Arrange with the teacher of the fourth grade class for you to bring the Student Questionnaire — Y ("Y" stands for Younger) to the class. Have the class fill out the questionnaires as you read the questions to them orally. Then collect the questionnaires.

   Tenth Grade Homeroom Class: Follow the same steps as with the fourth grade class (above), except:

   - Make the appointment with the homeroom teacher
   - Use the Student Questionnaire -- O ("O" stands for Older)
   - You don't need to read the questions orally to the tenth grade students.

A letter from us to the teacher and a description of the study are enclosed to help you talk to the teacher.

3. Fill out the School Description Form for both the elementary and the secondary schools so we know what kind of schools you have done your questionnaires in.

4. Drop Teacher Questionnaire off to the fourth grade teacher and the tenth grade homeroom teacher with the stamped, addressed envelopes we have provided, so that they can send the completed questionnaires to FRAC. (Please call them back in a week to make sure they haven't forgotten to fill out the questionnaire and send it to us.)

5. Drop Nurse Questionnaire off to the elementary school nurse and the secondary school nurse with the stamped, addressed envelopes we have provided, so that they can send the completed questionnaires to FRAC. (Please call them back in a week to make sure they haven't forgotten to fill out the questionnaires and send them to us.) A letter from us is enclosed to help you talk to the nurse.

6. Make an appointment to interview the principal personally with the Principal Questionnaire.

7. Make an appointment with the former school food service director to interview him/her personally with the Former School Food Service Director Questionnaire. A letter from us is enclosed along with a description of the study to help you talk to the former school food service director.

THANKS!

Appendix D

STATE CHILD NUTRITION DIRECTOR

DATE _____

STATE _____

YOUR NAME AND TITLE _____

This is part of a nationwide survey to find out how the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs have changed over the last year. Please answer all the questions that you can. Any information you can give us will be helpful. Thank you for your time and interest!

1. Have schools in your state dropped out of the National School Lunch Program in the 1981 - 1982 school year?

   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

   .If yes, what do you think the major reasons for this drop-out are?

   .If yes, which categories below do the majority of the schools that have dropped out of the National School Lunch Program during the 1981 - 1982 school year fit into? (Check any that apply.)

   1. [ ] large
   2. [ ] small
   3. [ ] rural
   4. [ ] urban
   5. [ ] suburban
   6. [ ] elementary
   7. [ ] middle
   8. [ ] secondary
   9. [ ] schools with a majority of poor children
   10. [ ] schools with a majority of non-poor children
   11. [ ] The characteristics of the schools that have dropped out vary so much that I can't fit them into particular categories.
   12. [ ] I don't know.

   . If yes, about how many of the schools that have dropped out are Title I schools? _____

2. Have children in your state dropped out of the National School Lunch Program in the 1981 - 1982 school year?

   1. [ ] yes 2. [ ] no

.If yes, why do you think children are dropping out?

3. Have schools in your state dropped out of the School Breakfast Program in the 1981 - 1982 school year?

1. [ ] yes 2. [ ] no

.If yes, what do you thing the major reasons for this drop-out are?

.If yes, which categories below do the majority of the schools that have dropped out of the National School Breakfast Program during the 1981 - 1982 school year fit into? (Check any that apply.)

1. [ ] large
2. [ ] small
3. [ ] rural
4. [ ] urban
5. [ ] suburban
6. [ ] elementary
7. [ ] middle
8. [ ] secondary
9. [ ] schools with a majority of poor children
10. [ ] schools with a majority of non-poor children

11. [ ] The characteristics of the schools that have dropped out vary so much that I can't fit them into particular categories.

12. [ ] I don't know.

. If yes, about how many of these schools that have dropped out are Title I schools?_____.

4. Have children in your state dropped out of the School Breakfast Program in the 1981 - 1982 school year?

1. [ ] yes 2. [ ] no

. If yes, why do you think children are dropping out?

5. Has the State Department of Education made any efforts to maintain or increase participation by schools in the National School Lunch Program and/or the School Breakfast Program in the 1981 - 1982 school year?

1. [ ] yes 2. [ ] no

.If yes, please describe these efforts.

6. Has the State Department of Education made any efforts to maintain or increase participation by children in the National School Lunch Program and/or the School Breakfast Program?

1. [ ] yes 2. [ ] no

.If yes, please describe these efforts?

7. What is the state-wide average charge for "paid" school lunches during the 1981 - 1982 school year? _____

8. What was the state-wide average charge for "paid" school lunches during the 1980 - 1981 school year?_____

9. Did your state provide any state funding for the National School Lunch Program (beyond what is required by the National School Lunch Act) during the 1980 - 1981 school year?

1. [ ] yes 2. [ ] no

.If yes, what did it pay for and how much did it contribute? _____

_____

10. Has your state provided any state funding for the National School Lunch Program (beyond what is required by the National School Lunch Act) during this 1981 - 1982 school year?

1. [ ] yes 2. [ ] no

.If yes, what does it pay for and how much does it contribute? _____

_____

11. Please fill in the charts below. If you do not have the exact information asked for, or if you do not have all the information, we would still appreciate receiving any relevant information that you do have. (Please feel free to attach your own charts if that would be easier.)

CHART I
NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

	1980-1981 school year (Jan-March average)			1981-1982 school year (Jan-March average)		
Average Daily Participation (Total)						
Average Daily Participation (Paid Lunches)						
Average Daily Participation (Reduced Price Lunches)						
Average Daily Participation (Free Lunch)						
	private	public	total	private	public	total
Number of Participating Schools						

CHART II
NATIONAL SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM

	1980-1981 school year (Jan-March average)			1981-1982 school year (Jan-March average)		
Average Daily Participation (Total)						
Average Daily Participation (Paid Breakfasts)						
Average Daily Participation (Reduced Price Breakfasts)						
Average Daily (Free Breakfasts)						
	private	public	total	private	public	total
Number of Participating Schools						

12. Is there anything else you would like to add?

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of School _____

City and State _____

Date _____

1. How many students are enrolled in your school? _____

2. How many students are enrolled in your classes? _____

3. What grade levels do you teach? _____

4. Do you notice any differences in your students between this year and last year that seem to be related to the loss of the Lunch Program in your school?

   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

   If yes, please describe these differences.

5. Attentiveness in class this year compared to last year is:

   1. [ ] improved
   2. [ ] about the same
   3. [ ] worse

6. Attendance this year compared to last year is:

   1. [ ] improved
   2. [ ] about the same
   3. [ ] worse

7. Behavior problems in class this year compared to last year are:

   1. [ ] increased
   2. [ ] about the same
   3. [ ] reduced

8. Classroom performance this year compared to last year is:

   1. [ ] improved
   2. [ ] about the same
   3. [ ] worse

9. Complaints of headaches, nausea, or stomachaches this year compared to last year are:

   1. [ ] increased
   2. [ ] about the same
   3. [ ] reduced

10. What is your best estimate of how many children in your classes go without lunch?

    1. [ ] _____
    2. [ ] I don't know

11. About what percentage of children in your classes do you think get an adequate lunch?

    1. [ ] 0-25%
    2. [ ] 25-50%
    3. [ ] 51-75%
    4. [ ] 76-100%
    5. [ ] I don't know.

12. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank you very much for your help!

NURSE QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of school _____

City and State _____

Date _____

1. How many students are enrolled in the school or schools you serve? _____

2. About how many students do you see in an average week? _____

3. Complaints of headaches, nausa, or stomachaches among students this school year compared to last school year are:

   1. [ ] increased
   2. [ ] about the same
   3. [ ] reduced

4. Do you notice any differences in the students between this school year and last school year that seem to be related to the loss of the Lunch Program in the school or schools you serve?

   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

   If yes, please explain.

5. What is your best estimate of how many children in the school or schools you serve go without lunch?

   1. [ ] _____
   2. [ ] I don't know.

6. About what percentage of children in the school or schools you serve do you think get an adequate lunch?

   1. [ ] 0-25%
   2. [ ] 26-50%
   3. [ ] 51-75%
   4. [ ] 76-100%
   5. [ ] I don't know.

7. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank you very much for your help!

INTERVIEW FORM — SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE DIRECTOR

Name of School _____

City and state _____

Enrollment of School _____

Date _____

1. What kind of food service do you have?

   1. [ ] on site-preparation
   2. [ ] central kitchen with satellite schools
   3. [ ] pre-plated meals
   4. [ ] other (please describe. _____
      _____)

2. What was the charge for paid lunches in your school during the 1980-1981 school year? _____

3. What is the charge for paid lunches in your school during this 1981-1982 school year? _____

4. How have you maintained the National School Lunch Program in your school despite cutbacks in federal funding? (Please check as many as apply.)

   1. [ ] increased cost of lunches for paying students
   2. [ ] changed management practices
   3. [ ] changed training practices
   4. [ ] changed equipment use
   5. [ ] increased volume of lunches prepared
   6. [ ] decreased volume of lunches prepared
   7. [ ] increased use of commodities
   8. [ ] increased use of cheaper food items
   9. [ ] addition of a la carte line or increase in a la carte items
   10. [ ] addition of vending machine
   11. [ ] addition of snack bar
   12. [ ] decrease number of employees
   13. [ ] use of volunteer labor
   14. [ ] changes in menu-planning
   15. [ ] omission of desserts
   16. [ ] changes in buying procedures
   17. [ ] changes in storage methods
   18. [ ] changed to a different food preparation and delivery system
   19. [ ] "merchandising" the Lunch Program to students
   20. [ ] different banking procedures
   21. [ ] other (Please describe.)_____
       _____
       _____
   22. [ ] we didn't need to make any changes.

5. Of all the changes you have made, please describe in more detail the <u>three</u> changes that have been <u>most crucial</u> in allowing you to maintain the Lunch Program in your school.

   # <u>1</u> -

#2 -

#3 -

6. Did you request any assistance from the district, state, or USDA regional office in adjusting to the budget cuts in the School Lunch Program?

   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

   If yes, what kind of assistance was provided?

7. Have a large number of children dropped out of your Lunch Program since last school year 1980-1981?

   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

   If yes, where are the children who have dropped out of the Lunch Program obtaining their lunch? (Please check the three most common sources of lunch for these students.)

   1. [ ] students bring their lunch from home.
   2. [ ] students don't eat lunch.
   3. [ ] students buy lunch from snack machines.
   4. [ ] students buy lunch from a la carte lines or snack bars at school.
   5. [ ] students buy lunch from bake sales or student stores.
   6. [ ] students buy lunch at a fast food restaurant.
   7. [ ] students buy lunch at a store.
   8. [ ] students buy lunch at a truck that sells food outside the school.
   9. [ ] other (Please describe.)_____
      _____
      _____
   10. [ ] I don't know

8. Do you get any state or local financing for your Lunch Program (beyond the federal reimbursements)?

   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

   If yes, has the local and/or state school lunch funding for 1981-1982 school year (compared to 1980-1981):

   1. [ ] increased?
   2. [ ] stayed the same?
   3. [ ] decreased?

9. Please fill out the chart below. If you don't have the information in this form, we would appreciate any information you do have.

	1980-1981 school year (Jan-March average)	1981-1982 school year (Jan-March average)
Average Daily Participation (Total)		
Average Daily Participation (Free Lunches)		
Average Daily Participation (Reduced Price Lunches)		
Average Daily Participation (Paid Lunches)		

10. How do you feel about the future of the Lunch Program in your school?

11. Is there anything else you would like to add about your School Lunch Program?

Thanks for your time and interest!

INTERVIEW FORM -- FORMER SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE DIRECTOR

Name of School _____

City and State _____

Enrollment of School _____

Name _____

Title (if not the former school food service director)_____

Date_____

1. When the National School Lunch Program was operated by your school, what did you like about the program?

2. What didn't you like about the Lunch Program?

3. When was the decision made that your school would drop out of the National School Lunch Program? _____

4. What were your school's School Lunch participation figures (average daily attendance) during the 1980-1981 school year?

   _____ average daily participation (total)
   _____ average daily participation for free meals
   _____ average daily participation for reduced price meals
   _____ average daily participation for paid meals

5. How many staff were employed by the Lunch Program in your school during the 1980-1981 school year? _____

6. How much did you charge paying students for the school lunch during the 1980-1981 school year? _____

7. What kind of food service did you have?

   1. [ ] on-site preparation
   2. [ ] central kitchen with satellite schools
   3. [ ] pre-plated meals
   4. [ ] other (please describe.)_____

8. Where are students getting food at lunch-time now? (Please check the three most common sources of lunch for students at your school.)

1. [ ] Students bring lunch from home.
2. [ ] Students don't eat lunch.
3. [ ] Students buy lunch from snack machines.
4. [ ] Students buy lunch from a la carte lines or snack bars at school.
5. [ ] Students buy lunch from bake sales or student stores.
6. [ ] Students eat lunch at a fast food restaurant.
7. [ ] Students buy lunch at a store.
8. [ ] Students buy lunch at a truck that sells food outside the school.
9. [ ] Other (Please describe.) _____
10. [ ] I don't know.

9. According to your best estimate, what percentage of students at your school eat an adequate lunch?

1. [ ] 1-25%
2. [ ] 26-50%
3. [ ] 51-75%
4. [ ] 76-100%
5. [ ] I don't know.

10. According to your best estimate, how many students at your school go without lunch?

1. _____
2. [ ] I don't know.

11. Has the Lunch Program in your school been replaced with any other source of food or meals?

1. [ ] yes
2. [ ] no

If yes, what is the replacement?

1. [ ] A locally-run, and locally funded lunch program.
2. [ ] A la carte line
3. [ ] Snack bar
4. [ ] Other (Please describe.) _____

If yes, approximately how many students use this replacement on an average day? _____

If yes, how much do students pay for the replacement lunch? _____

If yes, what kinds of foods or meals are offered to students by the replacement?

12. What were the major reasons why your school dropped the National School Lunch Program?

13. Which individuals and groups were consulted in making the decision to drop the National School Lunch Program in your school?

14. What arguments were made for and against dropping the Lunch Program?

For:

Against:

15. Was a public announcement made regarding the possible dropping of the Lunch Program?
    1. [ ] yes
    2. [ ] no

16. Was there a decrease in state or local funding for the Lunch Program (beyond the decrease in federal funding) for the 1981-1982 school year?

    1. [ ] yes
    2. [ ] no

17. Did your school request help or information from the district, state or U.S. Department of Agriculture Regional Office in making its decision about dropping the Lunch Program?

    1. [ ] yes
    2. [ ] no

    If yes, what help or information was provided?

18. What would have to change for the National School Lunch Program to be started again in your school?

19. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank you for your time and interest!

INTERVIEW FORM - PRINCIPAL

Name of School _____

City and State _____

Enrollment of School _____

Name and Title _____

Date _____

1. When the National School Lunch Program was operated by your school, what did you like about the program?

2. What didn't you like about the Lunch Program?

3. Now that your school does not operate the National School Lunch Program, where are students getting food at lunch time? (Please check the three most common sources of lunch for students at your school.)

1. [ ] Students bring lunch from home.
2. [ ] Students don't eat lunch.
3. [ ] Students buy lunch from snack machines.
4. [ ] Students buy lunch from a la carte lines or snack bars at school.
5. [ ] Students buy lunch from bake sales or student stores.
6. [ ] Students eat lunch at a fast food restaurant.
7. [ ] Students buy lunch at a store.
8. [ ] Students buy lunch at a truck that sells food outside the school.
9. [ ] Other (Please describe.) _____
10. [ ] I don't know.

4. According to your best estimate, what percentage of students at your school eat an adequate lunch?

1. [ ] 1-25%
2. [ ] 26-50%
3. [ ] 51-75%
4. [ ] 76-100%
5. [ ] I don't know.

5. According to your best estimate, how many students at your school go without lunch?

1. _____
2. [ ] I don't know.

6. What were the major reasons why your school dropped the National School Lunch Program?

7. Which individuals and groups were consulted in making the decision to drop the National School Lunch Program in your school?

8. What arguments were made for and against dropping the Lunch Program?

   For:

   Against:

9. Was a public announcement made regarding the possible dropping of the Lunch Program?
   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

10. What would have to change for the National School Lunch Program to be started again in your school?

11. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank you for your time and interest!

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE - Y

Grade _____ State _____

School _____

Date _____

Please read each question carefully, and put a check beside the answer that describes you.

1. Do you usually eat breakfast in the morning?

   1. [ ] often
   2. [ ] sometimes
   3. [ ] never

2. Do you usually eat lunch?

   1. [ ] often
   2. [ ] sometimes
   3. [ ] never

3. Did you eat lunch today?

   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

4. Where did you eat lunch today?

   1. [ ] I did not eat lunch today.
   2. [ ] I ate lunch at school.
   3. [ ] I ate lunch at home.

5. Where did you get your lunch today?

   1. [ ] I did not eat lunch today.
   2. [ ] I brought my lunch from home.
   3. [ ] I ate a school lunch.
   4. [ ] I bought some food from the snack machine.
   5. [ ] I ate food for lunch that a friend gave me.
   6. [ ] I bought my lunch at a store.

6. What did you drink for lunch today?

   1. [ ] I did not drink anything for lunch today.
   2. [ ] milk
   3. [ ] soda pop
   4. [ ] fruit or vegetable juice
   5. [ ] milkshake
   6. [ ] fruit punch, kool-ade, or orange-ade

7. What kinds of food did you eat for lunch today?

   1. [ ] I did not eat anything for lunch today.
   2. [ ] bread or a roll
   3. [ ] noodles or spaghetti
   4. [ ] chicken or fish
   5. [ ] a sandwich
   6. [ ] potato chips or corn chips or pretzels or french fries
   7. [ ] hot dog or hamburger
   8. [ ] a vegetable

9. [ ] cake or doughnut or cookie
10. [ ] pizza
11. [ ] a fruit
12. [ ] soup
13. [ ] ice cream
14. [ ] candy
15. [ ] cheese
16. [ ] burritos, tacos, or enchiladas

8. Do you get hungry during the afternoon?

1. [ ] often
2. [ ] sometimes
3. [ ] never

9. Do you feel sleepy or tired in the afternoon?

1. [ ] often
2. [ ] sometimes
3. [ ] never

10. Do you fall asleep in class in the afternoon?

1. [ ] often
2. [ ] sometimes
3. [ ] never

11. Do you have trouble paying attention in the afternoon?

1. [ ] often
2. [ ] sometimes
3. [ ] never

Thank you for answering these questions!

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE - O

Grade _____

School _____ State _____

Date _____

Please read each question carefully, and put a check beside the answer that describes you.

1. Do you usually eat breakfast in the morning?

   1. [ ] often
   2. [ ] sometimes
   3. [ ] never

2. Do you usually eat lunch?

   1. [ ] often
   2. [ ] sometimes
   3. [ ] never

3. Did you eat lunch today?

   1. [ ] yes
   2. [ ] no

4. Where did you eat lunch today?

   1. [ ] I did not eat lunch today.
   2. [ ] I ate lunch at school.
   3. [ ] I ate lunch at home.
   4. [ ] I ate lunch outside of school, but not at home.

5. Where did you get your lunch today?

   1. [ ] I did not eat lunch today.
   2. [ ] I brought my lunch from home.
   3. [ ] I ate a school lunch.
   4. [ ] I bought some food on the lunch line, but I didn't eat the school lunch.
   5. [ ] I bought some food from the snack machine.
   6. [ ] I ate food for lunch that a friend gave me.
   7. [ ] I bought my lunch at a store.
   8. [ ] I bought food sold by students at a bake sale or student store.
   9. [ ] I bought lunch at a fast food restaurant.
   10. [ ] I bought lunch at a truck that sells food outside the school.
   11. [ ] I bought my lunch at the school canteen or snack bar.

6. If you did not eat a school lunch today, how much money did you spend on lunch?

   1. [ ] between 0 and 25¢
   2. [ ] between 26 and 50¢
   3. [ ] between 51 and 75¢
   4. [ ] between 76¢ and $1.00
   5. [ ] between $1.01 and $1.25
   6. [ ] between $1.26 and $1.50
   7. [ ] more than $1.50

7. What did you drink for lunch today?

1. [ ] I did not drink anything for lunch today.
2. [ ] milk
3. [ ] soda pop
4. [ ] fruit or vegetable juice
5. [ ] milkshake
6. [ ] fruit punch, kool-ade, or orange-ade
7. [ ] other (Please describe.) _____

8. What kinds of food did you eat for lunch today?

1. [ ] I did not eat anything for lunch today.
2. [ ] bread or a roll
3. [ ] noodles or spaghetti
4. [ ] chicken or fish
5. [ ] a sandwich
6. [ ] potato chips or corn chips or pretzels or french fries
7. [ ] hot dog or hamburger
8. [ ] a vegetable
9. [ ] cake or doughnut or cookie
10. [ ] pizza
11. [ ] a fruit
12. [ ] soup
13. [ ] ice cream
14. [ ] candy
15. [ ] cheese
16. [ ] burritos, tacos, or enchiladas
17. [ ] other (Please describe.)_____

9. Do you get hungry during the afternoon?

1. [ ] often
2. [ ] sometimes
3. [ ] never

10. Do you feel sleepy or tired in the afternoon?

1. [ ] often
2. [ ] sometimes
3. [ ] never

11. Do you fall asleep in class in the afternoon?

1. [ ] often
2. [ ] sometimes
3. [ ] never

12. Do you have trouble paying attention in the afternoon?

1. [ ] often
2. [ ] sometimes
3. [ ] never

Thank you for answering these questions!

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Location

() Suburban

() Rural

() Urban

Size

() Large

() Medium

() Small

Income of Students

() Majority of low income students

() About half low income students and half non-poor students

() Majority of non-poor students

APPENDIX E

STATES RESPONDING TO
STATE CHILD NUTRITION DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE (44)

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Indiana
Iowa
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
North Dakota
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Puerto Rico
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wyoming

STATES NOT RESPONDING (8)

Illinois
Kansas
Massachusetts
New York
North Carolina
Ohio
Oklahoma
Wisconsin

APPENDIX F*

NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS LOST
(between 1980-81 and 1981-82)

	LUNCH					BREAKFAST				
	Total students	Paid	R.P.	Free	Total schools	Total students	Paid	R.P.	Free	Total schools
Alaska	+21,691	+26,576	+515	-9400	+36	+2703	+533	-316	+2466	+22
Arizona	-64,430	-42,342	-7206	-14,882	-48	no answer				
Arkansas	-43,442	-20,369	-3122	-19,951	na	-6884	-1956	-553	-4375	na
California	-155,523	-157,477	-10,664	+12,618	-80	-19,006	-28,165	-2,267	+11,426	-52
Colorado	-28,993	-13,927	-5,021	-10,045	+5	-5995	-1448	-749	-3798	-25
Connecticut	-15,471	-7781	-1801	-5889	-104	-1240	-562	-185	-493	-29
Delaware	-8652	-6332	-551	-1769	-20	-930	-911	-145	+126	-14
Florida	-80,630	-36,578	-11,441	-32,611	+15	-15,819	-8103	-3662	-4054	+81
Georgia	-44,685	-21,576	-2233	-20,871	na	no answer				
Hawaii	-3174	no answer			nc	-2145	no answer			nc
Idaho	+2363	-2409	-228	+5000	-5	+403	-168	-55	+625	-1
Indiana	-70,417	-52,267	-2,825	-15,325	+4	-15,145	-4916	-1064	-9165	+5
Iowa	-41,943	-33,596	-4276	-4071	-38	-3105	-1536	-384	-1185	+1
Kentucky	-15,336	-6039	-4182	-5115	-25	-11,706	-8106	-9042	+5442	-12
Maine	-18,700	-7150	-4600	-6950	-18	-2133	-310	-470	-1354	-27

* See footnotes on page 41-43 and 48 and 49.

	LUNCH					BREAKFAST				
	Total students	Paid	R.P.	Free	Total schools	Total students	Paid	R.P.	Free	Total schools
Maryland	-97,000	-64,000	-17,000	-16,000	-58	-14,581	-3400	-4800	-6381	-39
Michigan	-91,179	-95,461	-8893	+13,175	na	+22,338	+606	-356	+22,088	na
Minnesota	-77,452	-53,647	-23,805*		-84	-5403	-2086	-3317*		-31
Mississippi	-45,381	no answer			-2	-18,544	no answer			
Missouri	-80,371	-65,188	-6158	-9025	-56	-2873	-2130	-724	-19	-2
Montana	-6839	-3291	-1187	-2361	+3	-884	-425	-89	-370	-3
Nebraska	-24,376	-19,473	-2504	-2399	-14	-1115	-496	-210	-401	-8
Nevada	-12,509	-7169	-1120	-4220	na	-2974	-1069	-312	-1593	na
New Hampshire	-22,730	-16,060	-4170	-2500	na	-2566	-2733	+16	+151	na
New Jersey	-84,735	-44,354	-2474	-37,907	-226	-9395	-4189	-461	-4745	-101
New Mexico	-18,852	-1193	-2455	-15,204	+6	-8010	-1309	-1145	-5556	+1
North Dakota	+5930	+6558	-380	-595	+45	-284	-134	+20	+398	+6
Oregon	-26,652	-20,320	-4139	-2199	-19	+21	-1010	-280	+1311	+4
Pennsylvania	-275,827	-165,230	-38,489	-72,108	-90	-13,675	-3852	-1022	-8862	-78
Rhode Island	-13,305	-8120	-3195	-1990	-41	-1860	-1164	-187	-509	-25
South Carolina	-23,773	+827	-5048	-19,552	-12	-10,442	-1847	-1791	-6804	+1
South Dakota	-8,072	-4912	-1777	-1383	-8	-2144	-883	-430	-881	-10
Texas	-110,466	-21,330	-23,668	-65,468	+96	-60,632	-9917	-16,443	-34,272	+96

*Combines free and reduced price figures

	Total students	Paid	R.P.	Free	Total schools	Total students	Paid	R.P.	Free	Total schools
Utah	-32,052	-18,901	-9,102	-4,049	+3	-1781	-472	-277	-1032	+9
Vermont	-33,308	-19,355	-5905	-8048	-21	-3930	-2416	-342	-1172	-20
Virginia	-82,085	-62,186	-2052	-17,847	+39	-18,897	+3301	-1882	-20,316	-23
Washington, D.C.	-26,199	-4680	- 21,519*		na	-9564	-291	-1042	-8231	na
Washington	-75,125	-57,419	-8151	-9555	na	-7171	-2413	-1188	-3572	na
West Virginia	-28,875	-19,656	+170	-9389	na	+15,924	+5668	-1147	+11,403	na
Wyoming	-2834	-1476	-999	-359	-6	+109	-8	-14	+131	nc

*Combines free and reduced price figures

na = no answer

nc = no change

R.P. = reduced price

Materials from the
Food Research and Action Center

FRAC distributes periodic mailings with information on the food programs and related issues. In addition, we publish program Guides that explain the programs in easily-understood fashion. There is a charge of $20 to be placed on the mailing list to receive periodic mailings on program changes, developing issues, and all new Guides. All materials are free to those individuals and groups unable to afford the price.

- FRAC's Guide to Quality School Lunch and Breakfast Programs described these child nutrition programs; outlines methods of organizing a school breakfast campaign; and discusses ways of improving meal quality; March 1982; $2.00.

- FRAC's Profile of the Federal Food Programs, a short pamphlet describing FRAC and outlining the seven major government food programs; January 1982; single copies free (additional copies $.50 each).

- FRAC's Guide to the Food Stamp Program, detailing program operation in a simple, question-and-answer format; January 1982; $2.00.

- FRAC's Guia Para El Programa De Cupones Para Alimentos, Spanish version of FRAC's Guide to the Food Stamp Program; To be revised in 1982.

- The Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): A Success Story, a synopsis of each of the major medical evaluation studies done on the WIC program showing the positive effects of WIC on pregnancy outcome, growth, and incidence of anemia among WIC participants; June 1981; $.50.

- Food and Nutrition Issues in the Food Stamp Program, a thorough look at the nutritional and health aspects of the Food Stamp program, shopping patterns of Food Stamp shoppers, and positive economic impact of the Food Stamp Program; June 1981; $1.00.

- Fair Budget Action Campaign, (FBAC) Organizers Manual, provides information on the budget strategies of the Reagan Administration, content of specific proposals for FY 82, and suggestions for local action strategies; April 1982; $7.00.

- Doing More With Less: Maintaining Quality Child Nutrition Programs, a practical guide for school food service staff, school officials, parents and anyone else who wants to keep the child nutrition programs in operation in their communities. Ideas on saving money in local programs, increasing student participation and influencing decision-makers; January 1983.

- FRAC's Guide to State Legislation gives suggestions on how to lobby at the state level and includes chapters on state legislation in the areas of child nutrition programs, the Food Stamp Program, sales tax, and nutrition advisory committees; November 1982.

- Single page fact sheets on the federal food programs (e.g., WIC, elderly nutrition, food stamp, and child nutrition) are now available.